

THE
Holy Cheat :

PROVING,
From the Undeniable PRACTICES and
POSITIONS of the
PRESBYTERIANS,
THAT

The Design of that PARTY, is to en-
slave both KING and PEOPLE
UNDER THE

Masque of RELIGION.

By way of Observation upon a *TREATISE*, Entitu-
led, *The Interest of England in the Matter of*
RELIGION, &c.

By Roger L'Estrange.

The Fourth Impression.

L O N D O N ,

Printed 1662. and now Reprinted for Joanna Brome
near the West-End of St. Pauls, 1682.

Printed and now reprinted for James W.
at the Wolf-End of St. Paul, 1882.

TO THE READER.

T*His Treatise was Finished, and Published at the latter end of 1661. though Dated (to keep it the longer fresh) 1662. We had no New Saviours of the Nation, in those days; no Popish Plot, so much as dreamt of, unless you will have it to be Prophetically Calculated in favour of a Popish Conspiracy of almost twenty Years to come. The very Title-Page does abundantly speak my Thoughts of That, which at this day makes so scandalous a Noise in the World; (my apprehension of a Presbyterian Plot.) I did believe it, I have believed it ever since; and I do at this Instant believe it more than ever I did, by how much Proof and Experience is stronger than Conjecture. And yet my Guess, even so long ago, was Founded upon little less than a Demonstration, from the Methods, Pretexts and Proceedings of 1641. And I do here dese the most Critical and Censorious of my Adversaries, to say where I have made One False Step in the Contemplation of That Matter throughout the whole Discourse; and what One Point of Publick Disorder which is there foretold, is not plainly and undeniably come to pass. This is abundantly sufficient to clear me from any Design of Casting a Blind upon the Popish Plot, by amusing the Multitude with Stories of a Phanatical One; for my Thoughts upon that Subject,*

were the very same One and Twenty Years since, that they are now: so that the Cheat lies on the other side, that would be making a Shot at this King, from behind the same Stall that brought them within distance of his Blessed Father. Have not we the Martyrdom of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, over again in Case, Curtis? &c. Have we not Laud and Strafford over again in the Persons of the Present King's Publick Ministers? And we are upon the very same Tract over again, of making it Sedition to serve the King; and Popery, to defend the Church; and the Mark of a True Protestant, to Countenance and support the Rankest of Perjuries and Treasons in the Case of an Ignoramus, or Dissenting Brother. Or in one Word; He's a Papist that believes it possible for any Roman Catholick to be Innocent, or any Schismatick to be Guilty.

THE

r

T H E

Holy Cheat :

PROVING,

From the undeniable Practices and Positions of the Presbyterians, that the design of that Party is to enslave both King and Kingdom, under the Masque of Religion, &c.

IF the Author of the *Interest of England, &c.* had meant fairly to the Question, he would as well have told us the Good of *Bishops*, and the Ill of *Presbyters*, as he hath done the contrary, and never have concluded *For*, or *Against* Either, from the *Best* Actions of the *One*, and the *Worst* of the *Other*. At least, a man would think this partiality of Method, might content him without the service of those little Arts he uses to aid, and recommend his Undertaking. The Present state of things, he represents quite other than it is : and raises thence a Political expedience of doing This, or That, of Linking Interests, &c. never considering, that he Himself Creates that Interest, and gives Affairs the Face of that expedience. Page the 16. he laies his ground-work, In these following words.

Among the various dis-agreeing Parties within this Kingdom, which seem to render it an indigested Mass of people; two main ones appear above the rest, of so large an interest, that if by any means they might become no more twain, but one; they would take in, and carry along the whole stream and strength of the Nation. And these two are the Episcopal and Presbyterian Parties, each of them highly laying claim to the Protestant Religion. And undoubtedly whilst these two re-

The HOLY CHEAT.

main divided, the Kingdom of England, and the Protestant Religion is divided against it self. This dis-union is removed either by the Abolition of one Party, or by the Coalition of both into one. The former if supposed possible, cannot be accomplished but by violent and perillous ways and means. The latter is brought to pass by Accommodation or mutual yielding. Moreover there is a third way imaginable, Toleration indulged to the weaker side. In which of these ways lies the true Interest of the King and Kingdom is the great Case of the time, and the Subject of this Discourse, which presumes not to inform his Majesty, but in subordination unto his declared moderation and condescension, endeavours, by shewing things as they are, to convince and persuade Intrested persons, that the Pacification begun for this Interim may be intire and perfect, and fully settled for perpetual unity.

Let it be here observed, First, what the Difference is; Next, betwixt whom; In the Third place, the Danger of it; And Lastly, the Expedient to Remove it.

It seems, the *Episcopal*, and *Presbyterian* Parties, United in Religion, cannot Agree yet about Discipline, and while These Two remain Divided, the Publick is in Danger. From Hence results the Interest of Mutual Yielding— (his Coalition of Both Parties into One) Upon which Hinge, moves the whole frame of his Design; and in Two Pages, he gives the *Presbyter* Possession of his Claim, Deciding with exceeding ease, the Case of King and Kingdom.

Opinion is a great Mistress: for that which He so Magisterially Lays down, and Challenges, appears to Me, mis-stated, and worse Managed. I must confess, his Reduction of all other Interests under *Episcopal* and *Presbyterian*, is in some sense, no ill Dichotomy, That is; Intended of the Two mayn Parties, whereof, the One's Against the Law, the Other for it: But why the single Presbyterian should be Esteemed the Ballance of the Nation, I cannot Comprehend. If they are so, they should do well to cast their Cause upon a Popular Vote, and try the Issue by the Poll. For Quiet sake, no matter; Many or Few; there may be Equity where there wants Number. Wee'll rather see in point of Right, what 'tis they insist upon. [Only exemption from *Episcopal* Authority, in things Indifferent, and of *Humane* Institution.] To Clear this point, We have a judgment of Discretion too, as well as They; A Freedom, and Capacity to distinguish betwixt a Scandal Given, and Taken; betwixt an In-conformity proceeding from Conscience, and from Passion. Where the Dissent proceeds from

Conscience, a *Toleration* clears That *Scruple*: but our good peoples Liberty consists in Burthening Others, as well as freeing Them- selves; and That's *Intolerable*.

How many strange Indecencies are here, one upon the neck of Another! First, here's the *Minor* part imposing upon the *Major*: Secondly, a *Novel*, and *Vulgar Imagination*, bearing down an *Apo- stolical Institution*: Thirdly, a *Private Opinion*, contesting with a *Solemn*, and *Publick Sanction*: and Finally, the Subject of all this Earnestness, in their own phrase, is but a very *Accommodable difference*. From what I have said, I am persuaded, that *Tenderness* to the *Conscientious*, and *Severity* to the *Pertinacious Presbyter*, is the true Interest of this Nation. Well! But this Gentleman tells us, that *Abolition if Possible*, is *Perillous*, and *Toleration* only an *Imagi- nary Remedy*. Is not this to Intimate, that the Party makes less Conscience of a *Tumult*, than of a *Ceremony*: and to argue the necessity of *Complying*, from the *Danger of Refusing*? What would these people do if they had Power, that are so Bold without it! And yet our Politician tells us; It is the Kings Interest to Close with them; He means perchance, *According to the Covenant*. The *Coalition*, There, of all Schisms, and Heresies into One Interest, was of great Reason, and Important Service to the Com- mon work: but we are now advising how to *Settle*, not to *Dis- joyn*t a Government, and to Incorporate Dis-agreements, were to *begin* upon a Principle of *Confusion*. As the Case stands with us, in my weak Judgment, *Persons* should rather be Indulg'd, than *Parties*. My Reason is This; Some *Individuals* of that Per- suasion, have done His Majesty some Service, but (to the best of my Remembrance) the *Entire Party*, never any.

Yet One Reflexion more. Allow these People all their Ask- ings, in what concerns their *Discipline*; Will they rest Quiet There, without a further *Hankering* after more? (the *Legislative Pow- er* perhaps; the *Militia*; or some such Trifle.) I am the more suspicious, because I do not well remember, where ever That Party was satisfied with less than All. Nor need I look far back for Instances to justify my fears; But having in some measure hitherto Discovered his Foundation, wee'll forward now, and see what work he makes upon this Sandy Bottom: Taking his Title-page in my way; for to my thinking he stumbles at the Threshold. It runs thus.

The Interest of England in the Matter of RELIGION, unfolded in the Solution of these Three Questions.

- I. Q. *Whether the Presbyterian Party should in Justice, or Reason of State be Rejected and Depressed, or Protected and Encouraged?*
- II. Q. *Whether the Presbyterian Party may be Protected and Encouraged, and the Episcopal not Deserted nor Dis-obliged?*
- III. Q. *Whether the Upholding of both Parties by a just and equal Accommodation, be not in it self more desirable and more agreeable to the State of England, Than the absolute Exalting of the one Party, and the total Subversion of the other?*

Written by J. C.

I would fain know what's meant by *The Matter of Religion*, as it stands here related to *Civil Interest*? *Doctrine* it cannot be, for That were to advise a yielding upon a Principle of Policy, in Opposition to a Rule of Conscience: subjecting *Interest of Religion*, which is *Eternal Happiness*, to *Reason of State*, which regards but *Temporal Convenience*. If it be *Discipline*, What's that to the *Interest of England*? Our Settlement depends upon a due Obedience to the *Establish'd Law*; not the Encouraging of froward Humours, by an Audacious, and mis-govern'd-Zeal, under pretext of *Conscience*, to *Assront* it. Let *Authority Reform*, and *Private Persons*, either Obey, or Suffer; we are to Answer for our own faults, not those of the *Government*. And in fine, *If the Hill will not come to Mahomet, let Mahomet go to the Hill*.

After a pleasant *Breviate* of the Story of our late Troubles, (handsomely Penn'd indeed) in his tenth Page he takes his Biass.

At length (says he) *a full Tide of Concurring Accidents carries him* (the Duke of Albemarle, then General) *to a closure with the sober part of the Parliamentary party, who from first to last intended only a Reformation, and due regulation of things in Church and State, but abhorred the thought of destroying the King, or changing the Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom.*

I thought

I thought the *Act of Pardon and Oblivion*, had quieted all Animosities, and silenc'd all Discourses of this Quality ; but 'tis, it seems, *The Interest of England in the matter of Religion*, to keep the Quarrel waking ; and by Alierting the proceedings of the two Houses in the late War, to engage this King within the danger of his Fathers President. To be as free with the Authour, as he is with his Majesty, Ple put his meaning in a little plainer English.

Beside the Grand Division of the Nation into a *Royal*, and a *Popular Party* ; that Party which he here calls *Parliamentary*, is again *Split* ; and under this Subdivision, are Comprised , those which *did Actually* destroy the King ; and those which *by good Fortune*, did it *not*. (Plainer yet ; *Presbyterians*, and *Independents*.) The *Seber part*, (meaning the *Presbyterian*) He justifies *from first to last*, even to their very *Intentions*. (I must tread warily, for I am here upon a narrow, and a slippery path,) Not to Dispute the mans *Intuitive Knowledge* ; wee'll rather modestly believe that They mistook their way, than He, their meaning : for certainly, the *Murder* of the King, was not the only unlawful violence Acted upon that Sacred Person, and he that stops there, does as much as nothing. I would not touch upon this subject, were I not bound by Oath, and Duty, to discharge my soul, in what concerns the Honour, and the Safety of my Prince. Can the *first Cause*, asserted by both Houses, in opposition to His late Majesty, be justify'd, and not the King condemn'd ? And is not the Honor, and Safety of His Majesty that now is, concern'd in these Indignities upon His Murther'd Father ? What was *Then Lawful*, is so *Still* : and He that but implicitly charges the *Last King*, strikes at *This*. The text will bear no other sense without a Torture. But I shall by and by, compare him with himself. In the mean while we may explain one Presbyterian by another. *Douglas*, in 1651. preach'd the Kings *Coronation-Sermon*. Which since His Majesty's Return, is over and over again Re-printed.

A King (says he) *abusing his Power to the overthrow of Religion, Laws and Liberties, which are the very Fundamentals of this contract and Covenant may be controlled and opposed; and if he set himself to overthrow all these by Arms, then they who have power, as the Estates of a Land, may and ought to resist by Arms ; Because he doth, by that opposition, break the very bonds, and overthroweth all the essentials of this Contract and Covenant. This may serve to Justifie the proceedings of this Kingdom against the late King,*

who in an hostile way set himself to overthrow Religion, Parliaments, Laws, and Liberties.

I think this needs no comment, — About the same time, *Smectymnus* was revived by Mr. Manton, (a most aspicuous welcome doubtless to his Majesty) wherein five Champions of the Cause take up the Cudgels against one Bishop, on the behalf of Scandalous Pamphlets, and Tumultuary Petitions against Episcopacy. This is the naked Truth, what ever the Jolly Priest may tell the Reader, of the * Faction against which they dealt. Five Orthodox Divines he says were the Authors. Four of the Five I shall not mention, the Fifth was Marshall, of whose Divinity, a Taft; that by the sweet Agreement, we may the better Judge of Mr. Mantons. In a Letter printed 1643. arguing for the Authority of the two Houses. pag. 14. Thus: *Let every soul in England be subject to King and Parliament, for they are the higher powers ordained unto you of God, whosoever therefore resisteth King and Parliament, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.* The man was no Conjuror; yet he had wit enough, when Presbytery went down, to Court the rising Interest; and though the Common Prayer was an Abomination, to marry his Daughter by it, for fear of Afterclaps. But I suppose 'twas huddled up, as they do in their Churches that no man might be able to make Oath 'twas not the Directory. If the Case had been concerning the Allowance of Christian Burial to a Gentleman that was Quartered for his Loyalty. Or to Determine in the great point of the Late Kings Death, (upon an Anniversary Fast) whether or no 'twas Murther: Truly considering the Potent Arguments brought on both sides, 'tis possible that Mr. Marshal would have contented himself (as well as his Neighbours) to put the Case, and leave the point at last undecided to his Auditory.

Not to spend time, and paper needlessly, the whole stream of the Disciplinarians runs this way: only perhaps more or less Bold, and Open, according to the present strength, or weakness of the Faction. But to return. Can any thing be more gentle than A Reformation, and due Regulation of things in Church, and State: (words smoother than Oyl, yet are they very swords.)

First, to Reform, and Regulate, belongs to the Supreme Magistrate; if they intended That, they were to blame. Now take it in a Qualify'd, and softer sense, 'twas a Due Regulation they intended. To put this General notion in more Intelligible terms; upon this point depends no less than all that's dear to every Honest

nest man. The Dignity of the King, the Liberty of the Subject, the Freedom of Parliaments, and the Honor of the Nation. God knows my thoughts, I do not envy any man, either the Benefit of His Majesties Mercy, or the Blessing of his Favour, that hath the Grace at last, not to Abuse it. I look upon his Royal Act of Pardon with Reverence; and upon every soul within that Pale, as in a Sanctuary. But yet I do not understand a Pardon for one Rebellion, to be a Dispensation for another, nor how the Argument lyes from Fact, to Right. Under these two words, *the Regulation*; Thus much is comprehended, (waiving *less* Differences, and Greater.)

First, *The transferring of the Power of chusing Great Officers, and Ministers of State; from the King to the Two Houses.* Presbyterian Regulation.

2. *All matters of State, in the Interval of Parliaments must be Debated, and Concluded by a Council so Chosen, and in number, not above twenty five, nor under fifteen; and no Publick Act esteemed of any Validity, as proceeding from the Royal Authority, unless it be done by the Advice and Consent of the Major part of that Council; Attested under their Hands. And These too, sworn to the sense of Both Houses.*

3. *The Lords and Commons must be intrusted with the Militia.*

4. *His Majesty may appoint, but the Two Houses, or the Council, (in such manner as aforesaid) must Approve of All Governours of Forts, and Castles.*

Lastly, *No Peers hereafter made, must sit, or Vote in Parliament, unless Admitted thereunto by the consent of Both Houses.*

Upon these Terms; His Majesty shall be supported, in Honor, and Plenty; by his most Humble and Faithful Subjects, who have in their Thoughts, and Desires nothing more Precious, (next to the Honour, and immediate Service of God) than their just, and faithful performance of their Duty to the King, and Kingdom.

This is the *Due Regulation they Intended*: (for sure they Meant what they Proposed, to our Late Sovereign. I speak not this, of Persons, but of the Grofs of the Party; nor to reproach that neither; but to remove a Scandal from the Ashes of that
Blessed

Blessed *Martyr* ; and to direct a *Reverence* towards his Successor. What provocation have these restless People, now to revive This Question, but an unruly Impotency of passion against the Government ? This is their way. In *Generals*, they justify from first to last, the *Presbyterians* Cause. The Multitude, they, look into *Particulars* : and from those Injuries which the Late King suffered, draw Inferences Dishonourable, and Dangerous to This. In the next Period, methinks he falls upon a *Non sequitur*.

The Re-admission of the Secluded Members, (he saies) did *Necessarily* draw after it, the restoring of King, Lords, and Commons, according to the *Ancient Constitution*. Pag. 10. Not *Necessarily*, (under Favour) according to the *Ancient Constitution* : (I will not say, nor probably ; but) there were two shrewd Blocks cast in the way. The First, in the *Militia* ; where no Comissionated Officer was to Act, that should not first acknowledge in these words, *viz.*

I do acknowledge and Declare, that the War undertaken by Both Houses of Parliament in their Defence against the Forces raised in the Name of the Late King, was Just and Lawful ; and that Magistracy and Ministry, are the Ordinances of God.

The Second, was in the exclusion of the Royal Party from the next Choice, as followeth.

Resolved that all and every Person who have advised or voluntarily aided, abetted, or assisted, in any War against the Parliament (since the first day of January 1641.) his or their Sons, unless he or they have since Manifested their good affections to this Parliament, shall be incapable to be elected to serve as Members of the next Parliament.

Now how a Choice thus limited in the House, and Principled in the Field, should *Necessarily* set us right, does not to me appear. Perhaps it was the most the Time would bear : but God forbid, *That Declaration charging the Guilt, and Blood of the late War upon the King*, should stand upon Record to future Generations. *Whoever affirms, That War was lawfull*, does beyond Question, meditate Another ; not to say more then needs ; It Blasts the Memory of the Late King, and upon the King that now is, it reflects many Mischiefs : subjecting both his Dignity, and Person to His Fathers Hazards. It administers Argument for a new War ; and shakes the very Foundation of Royalty. Allow but *That* ; the Act of Oblivion is on the wrong side ; If the King was in Fault, the *Presbyterians* must Grant the Pardon from the clear Reason

Reason of the matter in it self, and from the obvious Consequences ; (beside that justice which both King and People owe to the Ashes of a Father and a Sovereign) It seems to me of high Concern, to Counterstate that Declaration, and *Place the Militia of this Nation now in such hands as will acknowledge the Late Kings Quarrel was Defensive.* I am the bolder in this Particular, because I find the Faction pressing beyond both Modesty and Reason, upon this Bottom. Where Majesty it self is Affronted, it were a second Injury to allow the Servant better Quarter, than the Master. But they are very Exact, and Carefull in this Point : as will appear in what follows.

After a dreadful Earthquake, shaking all the Powers of the Kingdom, and overturning the very Foundations; and after a new frame of things, erected, standing for divers years, & seemingly stated for perpetuity; the Regal Family and Government is raised up again, not by the Power or Policy of that Party who fought under the Banner of his late Majesty in the Wars, between Him & both Houses of Parliament; But by the restless desire of the Nation, and the vigorous actings of the City of London, with the concurrence of the Secluded Members of the Long Parliament, in conjunction with that Renowned Person who then held the power of the Sword. Pag. 12. Let it be noted here, that (by his Confession) *the War was between the King and both Houses of Parliament.* Now to that Party who fought under the Banner of His Late Majesty; (whom he might have spared for the General's sake) Truly Considering what havock hath been made of them, by Slaughters, Extrajudicial Sentences, Plunders, Sequestrations, Imprisonments, Banishments ; Shipping them away into Plantations &c.——And this for twenty years continuance. 'Tis no great wonder to find some Abatement of their Power. But to affirm they contributed nothing to His Majesties Restauration, is very unkind, and something Rash ; The Nation did ; (he sayes) the City of London, and the Secluded Members of the Long Parliament ; but not That Party. A pleasant and Phantastical Dis-junction ! This way of barely Affirming, and Denying ; Crying One Party Up, and the Other Down, and proving nothing, is neither Mannerly, nor Prudent. How comes this man of *Metaphysical Inspection*, that reads the very Thoughts of the Presbyterians, and seems so well enformed in all the Actings of the Royal Party ; How comes he by this wonderful Insight and Intelligence ? Does he not find that all he sayes is nothing, unless he can See things Invisible, and Prove Negatives ? Is This the Work of the Spirit of

Pacification ? Or will he tell us, in the Holy Dialect, that 'tis the *Enmity* betwixt the *Seed of the Woman* and the *Seed of the Serpent* ? So far were we, (for I write my self of that Party) from this Unfriendly, and Unchristian Temper of Dis-uniting, that we Declared unanimously against it, binding our selves by all that's Sacred, to an Eternal Union with all Parties, in order to the Restauration of His Majesty, all Differences apart; of what Degree or Quality soever. In This we had an eye to the Kings Interest, and to the Nations; for it Referred both to His Majesties Return, and to a Lasting Peace: the former being Facilitated by that Conjunction of *Interest*; and the Latter provided for by a Conciliation of *Affections* to be wrought by suppressing all *Motions* toward Revenge in the one Party, and the *Fears* of it in the other. It had been good manners to have met us half way; but truly high Discretion, as well as Common Equity, to Close with us, and entertain the Offer. Now far from this, we do not only get not one *Good* word, but many a *Bad* one; Such as those People that will never Leave the King, are to expect from such as do not love Him. Our Adversary talks much of the *Gospel*. Is it a *Gospel-Precept*, to render Evil for Good? What I have shewed already, that the Kings Party did, amounts to somewhat more than nothing. We'll see a little further, allowing yet to all that Acted in that work their share of Glory.

The Duke of *Albemarle* was the Leading Card, then in the head of an Army, better dispos'd to his Command, than Design; and to him the Honest part of the City and Nation were no ill Seconds. But till he had tasted and try'd them, he did well to walk warily: and rather take the middle and safer way of Gratifying All Interests then on foot, then the more Positive, and Hazzardous, of disobliging any two Parties, in favour of the Third.

For there were then Three several Interests in Play; The *Kings*, the *Presbyterians*, and the *Phanatiques*; the *Royal* Party press'd for a Free Choice and Convention, without *Prelimitation*. The *Presbyterians* urg'd a Re-admission of the *Secluded Members*. The *Phanatiques*, they were for filling up the House, according to such Qualifications as the Rump should resolve upon. The Course the General steer'd was This: The Rump Continued; the *Secluded Members* Returned; and the *Royalists* were satisfy'd, with the Assurance of a new Choicé soon After. His Excellence acting in this Affair rather as a Conciliator, than a Party, and in order to a Settlement, giving things the best Consistency they would

would then bear. *But had the ancient Stock of Royalists no hand at all in this procurement?* It never came to blows, so that the matter Rests upon the Effects of Policy, & Counsel; whereof our undertaker cannot give any absolute account, nor shall we in our just Apology, exalt our selves, and Cry, *We, brought the King in.* That's *Presbyterian Language.* We did not drive Him out, we'll say; and that we joynd with many Thousands, as honest as our selves, in Duty to Restore Him. Where there was place for Action, and to do the King a service that way, we never Articled for Offices or Rewards, but without further care of Interest, pursu'd our Duties. In fine, the Loyal part of the Nation was animated by the same Soul, joynd Stocks and Councils: and many thousands of Brave Fellows that never saw the King, were Proud and Ambitious to Dye for Him. I could say what was undertaken by the Old Royal Party, particularly, in *Hewsons Scuffle*, (and indeed where not) but that it casts a Slurr upon some of His Majesties new Friends. This however, those Lads of the City, that would have done the work without more adoe, had they not been Muzzled by some of their Mungrel Magistrates, that Dined with the *Mayor*, and Supp'd with the *Committee of Safety*: Those honest people will, if need be, bear witness for us, and in like manner the whole Nation; That by Action, Counsel, Writing, we did all that was possible in the Business. What I have delivered in defence of the Royal Party, does very well agree with His Majesties Testimony of the Other, in His Gracious Speech to the House of Peers, for hastning the *Act of indemnity*: which yet our Authour cites against us.

My Lords, if you do not joyne with Me in extinguishing those fears which keeps mens hearts awake, and apprehensive of safety and security, you keep Me from performing my promise, which if I had not made, I am perswaded that neither I nor you had been now here: I pray you let Us not deceive those who brought Us, or permitted Us, to come together.

The King does not There say so much who Brought Him in, as who Permitted His Restoring; Implying too, that He was fain to Condition for it, but withal, a great Earnestness to perform His promise. Had but this Gentleman considered as well what the King said at the *Passing* of the *Indemnity*, as the *Hastening* of this wrangle would have been saved. Ple do him the service to mind him of it.

I do very willingly pardon all that is pardoned by this Act of Indempnity, to that time which is mentioned in the Bill. Nay I will tell you, that from that time to this day, I will not use great severity, except in such Cases where the Malice is Notorious, and the Publick Peace exceedingly concerned. But for the time to come, the same Discretion and Conscience which disposed Me to the Clemency I have expressed, which is most agreeable to My Nature, will oblige Me to all Rigor and Severity, how contrary soever it be to My Nature, towards those who shall not now Acquiesce, but continue to manifest their Sedition and Dislike of the Government either in Action or Words. And I must conjure you all (My Lords and Gentlemen) to concur with Me in this just and necessary Severity; And that you will in your several Stations, be so jealous of the publick peace, and of my particular Honour, that you will cause exemplary Justice to be done upon those who are guilty of Seditious Speeches, or Writings, as well as those who break out into Seditious Actions: And that you will believe those who delight in reproaching and traducing My Person, not to be well affected to you and the Publick Peace. Never King valued himself more upon the Affections of His People, than I do; Nor do I know a better way to make My Self sure of your Affections, than by being Just and Kind to you all, and whilst I am so, I pray let the world see, that I am possessed of your Affections. Thus far the Ground work; now the goodly Structure.

*His Majesty thus brought back to a willing and free-spirited people by their own Act, (Pag. 14.) beholds his undoubted Interest set forth to his hand, and made plain before him, which is no other, than a well tempered and composed State of Affairs both Religious and Civil in all his Dominions, by the abolishing of former differences, and the reconciling of all reconcileable Parties; and especially of those grand Parties, which (if made one) do upon the matter carry the whole Nation. And this His Majesties Wisdom hath already observed in that excellent Proclamation against vicious, debauched, and prophane persons, in these words [That the Reconciliation and Union of hearts and affections can only with Gods blessing make us rejoycing in each other, and keep
our*

our Enemies from rejoycing.] *And this is the earnest expectation and hope of the Religious, and well-affected to the publick Tranquillity, That the King, our Supreme Head and Governour, whose gracious Disposition, doth not suffer him to cleave to any divided part of his Subjects, and to reject others that are alike Loyal, will as a Common Father, protect and cherish all those that are found capable and worthy; and become our great Moderator by His Authority and Wisdom, to lessen Differences, and allay Animosities between dissenting brethren, which already agree in the main Points of Religion.*

Having hitherto asserted, that those who fought under the late Kings Banner, were not His Majesties Friends, and that those that fought against it, ever were: he proceeds now to a Conclusion suitable to his premises, and states the Interest of the King in favour of that Voluntary Mistake: directing an Accord *betwixt all Reconcilable Parties*, and an Indulgence toward all those that are *found Capable, and Worthy*. In *Both* (and in *All*) Cases, the Presbyterian himself must be the Judge: and then we know what will become of *Royalists* and *Bishops*. The Kings Friends have ever had the Honour to be Divided (by these People) into persons *Popishly affected, Evil Counsellours, and Loose Livers*; and it is evident, that they design, under these Limitations of *Reconcilable, Capable and Worthy*, to cast all such as Conscienciously, and frankly adhere to *Monarchy*, and *Episcopacy*, out of the terms of their pretended Pacification. All those that *They find Capable, and Worthy*, and esteem *Reconcilable*, shall be admitted. And now the *Question* is,

I. Qu. *Whether in Justice or Reason of State the Presbyterian Party should be Rejected and Depressed, or Protected and Encouraged.*

It would be first agreed what's meant by the *Presbyterian Party*: We'll weigh the *Justice, and Reason* of the Proposition afterward: his own Remark upon it is not amiss.

As concerning their true Character, the Notation of the name whereby they are called, is both too shallow and too narrow for it. The word Presbyterian hath not sufficient depth to go to the root of the matter, nor breadth sufficient to comprehend this sort of men. That Form of Ecclesiastical Government by Parochial and Classical Presbyteries, Provincial and National Assemblies, is remote enough from their main Cause, and those firm bonds that make them eternally one, in respect whereof many that approve a regulated Episcopacy will be found of their number, Pag. 19.

'Tis truly, and well said. Their *Cause* is not the *Form*, but the *Exercise* of Government: for they like well enough to have that Power Themselves, which they condemn in Others. Nor do I doubt but *many of them approve a Regulated Episcopacy*; that is, a *Presbytery* in a *Bishops* seat, where the *Office* appears *Regulated by the Person*, as 'tis in a *Regulated Monarchy*; Where the King's subject to the *Law*, and the *Law* to the *two Houses*. But I condemn not All, that wear that Character. The Wise, and Honeit Few of that Denomination, who keep themselves within the terms of Duty, and the Question: Such as can talk of the Church, without disturbing the State; and debate their private Opinions, without giving publick Scandal: For these, I have much Charity, and Reverence, and wish as great a tenderness toward them, as they themselves desire. But where I see a Bold Seditious Faction, bidding defiance to the Civil Magistrate under the Churches Colours: I find not any thing so Sacred in the Name of *Presbyterian*, as to protect a Turbulent Party assuming that Appellation. It will be urg'd, that they do as little Justify the *Seditious*, as I condemn the *Sober Presbyterian*. But to agree that point, I'll prove, that the same Party, for whom they plead, and against whom I engage, are no less Enemies to the *King*, and *People*, than to *Bishops*: and which is more; from their own practices, and positions; I'll make this good. Yet one would hardly guess this from their Character.

As concerning their main and rooted principles, Pag. 20. They admire and Magnifie the holy Scriptures, and take them for the absolute perfect Rule of Faith and Life, without the supplement of Ecclesiastical Traditions; yet they deny not due respect and reverence to venerable Antiquity. They assert the study and knowledge of the Scriptures to be the duty and privilege of all Christians, that according to their several capacities being skilful in the word of Righteousness they may discern between good and evil, and being fill'd with all goodness may be able to exhort and admonish one another: Yet they acknowledge the necessity of a standing Gospel Ministry, and receive the directive authority of the Church not with implicate Faith, but the judgment of Discretion: They hold the teaching of the Spirit necessary to the saving knowledge of Christ: Yet they do not hold that the Spirit bringeth new Revelations, but that he opens the eyes of the Understanding to discern what is of old revealed in the written Word; They exalt divine Ordinances, but debase humane Inventions in Gods Worship, particularly Ceremonies properly Religious, and of Instituted Mystical Signification: Yet they allow the natural expressions
of

of Reverence and Devotion, as kneeling and lifting up of the hands and eyes in Prayer; as also those meer Circumstances of Decency and Order, the omission whereof would make the service of God either undecent or less decent. As they worship God in the spirit according to the simplicity of Gospel Institutions, so they rejoice in Christ Jesus, having no confidence in a legal Righteousness, but desire to be found in him who is made unto us Righteousness by gracious Imputation: Yet withal they affirm constantly that good works of Piety towards God, and of Justice and Charity towards men are necessary to Salvation. Their Doctrine bears full Conformity with that of the Reformed Churches held forth in their publick Confessions, and particularly with that of the Church of England in the nine and thirty Articles, only one or two passages peradventure excepted, so far as they may import the asserting of Prelacy and Humane Mystical Ceremonies. They insist much on the necessity of Regeneration, and therein lay the ground-work for the practice of Godliness: They press upon themselves and others the severe exercise not of a of a Popish, outside, formal, but a spiritual and real mortification, and self-denial, according to the power of Christianity. They are strict observers of the Lords day, and constant in Family Prayer: They abstain from Oaths, yea petty Oaths, and the irreverent usage of Gods name in common discourse; and in a word, they are sober, just and circumspect in their whole Behaviour. Such is the temper and constitution of this Party, which in its full latitude lies in the middle between those that affect a Ceremonial Worship, and the height of Hierarchical Government on the one hand, and those that reject an ordained Ministry and settled Church order, and regular Unity, on the other hand.

Here is much said and little prov'd; Only a Pharisaical Story, of what they are not, and what they are; that they are not as other men are, and their bare word for all. The Tale is well enough told to catch the silly vulgar, that look no further than Appearances: But to a serious Person, how gross, and palpable is the Imposture! In the main points of Doctrine they fully agree with the nine and thirty Articles: and 'tis but peradventure, that they differ, in one, or two passages, so far as they may import the Asserting of Prelacy and humane Mystical Ceremonies. Behold the mighty Subject of an Holy War; the goodly Idol to which we have Sacrific'd so much Christian Blood. Can any man imagine this the True, and Conscientious reason of the Quarrel, Or that the middle way our Presbyter steers betwixt *Phanaticism*, and Popery, is the just measure of the Case? But hear him on, and he'll tell you that the Party is Numerous as well as Godly.

Within these extensive limits the Presbyterian Party contains several thousands of learned, godly orthodox Ministers, being diligent and profitable Preachers of the Word; and exemplary in their Conversation; among whom there are not a few that excell in Polemical and Practical Divinity; also of the judicious, sober, serious part of the People, (in whose affections his Majesty is most concerned) they are not the lesser number. By means of a practical Ministry this way like the Leaven in the Gospel-parable hath spread and seasoned the more considerate and teachable sort in all parts of the Kingdom, and especially in the more Civilized places, as Cities and Towns. Pag. 23.

It had been well our Undertaker had put his Orthodox, & Learned Thousands upon the List: for that Party is a little given to false Murders. How many forg'd Petitions and Remonstrances what Outcries from the Press & Pulpit, in the name of the people, when yet the fortieth part of them were never privy to their own Askings? Of

* See the History of the English and Scotch Presbyterian, page 316.

* ninety and seven Ministers within the Walls of London, fourscore and five were driven from their Churches, and Houses, at the beginning of our Troubles; and notwithstanding the monstrous Clamours which occasion'd the Conference at Hampton Court, in 1603. Archbishop Spotswood tells us, that [of above nine thousand Ministers, but forty nine appeared upon the Roll, that stood out. and were deposed for disconformity: Such a noise will a few Disturbers cause in any Society were they are tolerated. Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland Pag. 479.

The Presbyterians practical Ministry.

Touching his Practical Ministry; I'll grant the Cause is much beholden to the Pulpit, and that without the aid of seditious Lectures, I do believe the Strife had never come to Blood: But yet these Preachments did not the whole Busynesse. Do not we know what Craft and Violence hath been used to Cheat, & Force the People; what Protections, Covenants, and Negative Oaths have been Imposed, upon pain of Imprisonment, Banishment, Sequestration? Have not all Schools, and Nurseries of Piety and Learning been subjected to the Presbyterian mode, and many thousands of Godly, and Reverend Divines, reduced to begge their Bread because they would not Covenant, yet all too little to procure either a General Kindnesse, or submission to their Principles?

For the Reasons afore-going the infringement of due Liberty in these matters would perpetuate most unhappy Controversies in the Church from Age to Age. Let the Former times come in and give Evidence, As

Pag. 25. *As touching Ceremonies, the Contest began early, even in King EDWARD's Reign; between Hooper and other Bishops. The Consecration of Hooper Elect Bishop of Gloucester being stayed, because he refused to wear certain Garments used by Popish Bishops, he obtained Letters from the KING, and from the Earl of WARWICK, to the Arch-Bishop of CANTERBURY, and others, that he might not be burthened with certain Rites and Ceremonies, and an Oath commonly used in the Consecration of Bishops, which were offensive to his Conscience. Nevertheless he found but harsh dealing from his Fellow-Bishops, wherof some were afterwards his Fellow-Martyrs, and Ridley among others, who afterwards thus wrote unto him, when they were both Prisoners for the Gospel. [" However in time past in certain Circumstances, and by " matters of Religion, your wisdom, and my simplicity (I grant) hath a " little jarred, each of us following the abundance of his own sence and " judgment ; Now be assured, that even with my whole heart in the " Bowels of Christ I love you in the truth, and for the truths sake which " abideth in us.] Some godly Martyrs in Queen MARIES days disliked the Ceremonies ; and none of them dyed in the defence of Ceremonies, Liturgy and Prelacy, in opposition to all other Ecclesiastical Government and Order. It was the Protestant verity which they witnessed and sealed in blood in opposition to Popery, especially the prodigious Opinion of Transubstantiation, and the Abomination of the Romish Mass, or Sacrifice. In the same bloody days certain English Protestants being fled for refuge into Germany, and settled at Frankford, were divided amongst themselves about the Service-book, even with scandalous breach of Charity, and in the issue the Congregation was sadly broken and dissipated.*

What is intended by *due Liberty*, might be a *Presbyterian*
 Doubt, but the Coherence renders it, a *Free-Liberty*
 of Acting to all intents and purposes at pleasure (whether without Law, or against it, no matter) according to such precedents of former times, as our Resolver refers unto, and justifies. He tells us, *the Contest about Ceremonies began early* ; and so in truth it did: For in the time of King Edward, this were a wambling toward the Geneva Discipline ; but neither very earnest, nor very popular : and *That* (so far as I can learn) procured even by the Author of that Platform, Calvin himself. Concerning *Godly Martyrs in Queen Maries days* ; Some suffered that disliked the Ceremonies : Others, that liked them. That *none* died in defence of *them*, is a Remarque might have been spared : For the Question was matter of Faith, not Discipline.

Discipline. The *Franckford Breach* indeed was a sad Story: but yet, considering the *Dividers*, of no great *Hencur* or *Authority* to our Friends purpose. *Knox* and *Whittingham* were the prime Ring-leaders in this Disorder, who upon some Disputes started about the Service Book, joyning with others of the Consistorian stamp, drew such an extract of it, as they thought fit, and sent it to *Calvin*, requesting his opinion of it. Such was the Answer they received, as blew the whole Congregation into a flame, from whence arose that scandalous breach ensuing, viz. The *English Service* being established, *Whittingham*, *Gilby*, *Goodman*, with some others, *Divided*, and went to *Geneva*, whence, both by *Letters*, and Discourses they tampered the Ministers and People of *England*, and *Scotland*, into a revolt, encouraging them to set up their new Discipline, in despite of all Opposers whatsoever.

The Gospel returning under Queen Elizabeth, these Differences were revived and held up by Disputes, Writings, and Addresses, to several Parliaments and there were great thoughts of heart for these Divisions, Pag. 27.

Why this is English yet: it is but turning now to *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign to understand these People, and unriddle the *Due Liberty* they plead for. (But of This, in its proper place.) Having drawn down the Quarrel from *Edward the Sixth*, to the blessed Restoration of *Charles the Second*, (whom God protect) he proceeds to descant upon the Present.

The greatest part of the Ministers named Puritans yielded Conformity to those controverted Rites and Forms, that were by Law or Canons established, as to things burdensome, not desirable; in their nature supposed indifferent, but in their use many ways offensive; and groaning more and more under the yoke of bondage (as they conceived) they waited for deliverance, and were in the main, of one soul and spirit with the Non-conformists. And even then the way called Puritanism did not give but get ground. But now the Tenents of this way are rooted more than ever; and those things formerly imposed, are now by many, if not by the most of this way, accounted not only burdensome, but unlawful, Pag. 28.

The consequences of Presbyterian Liberty.

But is it so, that the Matters by Law established, in themselves Indifferent, and only Burthenome to day, (*rebus sic stantibus*) may become Unlawful to morrow? By the same Rule Kings may be taken away as well as Bishops; all Dignities and Powers being alike submitted to a Popular Level; For if the people shall think fit to say,

say, the Magistrate is unlawful, as well as the *Ceremony*, by the same Reason he may destroy *One* with the *Other*; and Virtually he does it. We know the *Rites* and *Forms* of Worshipping, are not of the *Essence* of Religion, and the huge bustle about Discipline, is only an appeal to Ignorance, and Tumult. *The Church must be Reformed.* By whom? Not by the Rabble. What means this application then of so many factious Sermons, and Libels to the *People*? They are not Judges of the Controversie. But in a Cause more capable of *Force* than *Argument*, they do well to Negotiate, where *Clamour*, and *Pretence*, weigh more than *Modesty* and *Reason*. If a man asks, by what Commission act these Zelots? They answer readily: *'Tis Gods Cause, and better obey God than Man.* He that said, *Give not Credit to every Spirit*; I suppose knew as much of Gods mind, as our Illuminates. Is not mistaken, or perverted Scripture, the ground of all *Schism*, and *Heresie*? *Counsels may Erre*, they say, and cannot *Presbyterians*? How comes this Party to be more Infallible than their Neighbours? If they are not, let but all other people of Different Judgments take the same Freedom they do, of out-cries against any thing, under pretext of Conscience; let any man imagine the confusion. For, *where every man is his own Judge, All men shall Dispute, till each Particular condemns himself: so that the Strife is Endless, and the Event Restlessness, and Confusion.*

This comes of not submitting to some Final, and Over-ruling Decision. Upon this pinch, at a dead list, they fly to their *Judgment of Discretion*: which leaves them still at Liberty to shape their Duty to their Profit. They tell us; *They'll be tryed by the Word of God*: not heeding, how *That* is again to be Try'd by *Them*: so that in Issue, their private interpretation of the Scriptures must pass for the *Law Paramount*, to which both King and People are equally, and indispenably subjected. Undoubtedly, what God *Commands*, we ought to do, and not to do what he *forbids*. This in few words, comprizes the Duty of Reasonable Nature, without distinction either of *Offices* or *Persons*. But these Inviolable *Fundamentals* apart, the *Accidents* of worship, the *Modes* of doing this or that; The *How, When, Where, &c.* are left various, and variable, according to the several Respects of *Manners, Times, and Places*; at the Discretion of those Rulers whom God sets over us. Where we find matters of this middle nature orderly settled, and dispos'd, we are commanded to *submit to these Humane Ordinances for the Lords sake*: and not to Obtrude upon

the word for *Conscience*, such Disagreements, as effectually arise from *Peevishness*, or want of due *Enquiry*. But why do I talk to those that stop their Ears?

Their minds (says he) *are fix'd in this Opinion, after a long time of search and practice, and are not like to be reduced to the practice of former times, Pag. 29.* This is but *Martin Junior Reviv'd*, who says, That it will be very dangerous, to our State, to maintain two contrary *Factions*: That the *Magistrates* are then bound, even for the quieting of our State, to put down the one: that those that stand for the *Discipline*, neither can nor will give it over, (so as they will not be put down) and that the said *Magistrates* cannot maintain the corruption of our Church, namely, *Arch-Bishops, and Bishops*, without the discomentment of their *Subjects*. Will not this Argument from Search and Practice, absolve them from Obedience to the King, as well as to the Church? Has not the *Regal Power* been scann'd and sifted, as well as the *Ecclesiastick*: or have their *Practices* been more favourable to His Majesty, than to the Clergy? But [*their minds are fix'd, and not to be reduced.*] This is to say, that if the Law and they cannot agree, they'll tug for't, upon this supposition, thus he concludes. That [*in all reason, the imposing of such matters of Controversie, as by so many are held unlawful, and by those that have a Zeal for them, judg'd indifferent, not necessary, cannot procure Peace of Church and Kingdom, Pag. 29.*] I say on the Contrary, That the peace of Church, and Kingdom cannot be preserved, where every Private and Licentious Spirit shall dare to question the Authority of either. In fine, admit the *Scruple* truly conscientious: It would be well yet, that such as Fault the present Government, would Frame another, that should be lyable to no exceptions, before they alter This. If that cannot be done, let us Rest Here; for if we are bound to change till all are pleas'd, never must we expect to be at quiet. Some Consciences will have no *Magistrates* at all; Others will Govern those they have, or Quarrel with them. To Reconcile these Two in any end of Settlement, is as Impossible as 'tis Unsafe to put much power into the Hands of people, so dangerously principled: But to Destroy a Government, none agree better, and this we speak upon Experience.

From hence, to his 40th. Page, I find little but Rapture, in commendation of the *Presbyterians*, with now and then a snap at the late *Prelates*, which is beside my purpose. See now his Complement to the King.

Blessed be God for our gracious Sovereign, who makes it his care and study to allay distempers, and compose differences by his just and gracious Concessions already published concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs. Pag. 40.

For fear His Majesties Concessions should be taken for a pure Act of Grace, they are epitheted, *Just*, as well as *Gracious*, to lessen the *Favour*, by intimating the *Duty*: What Return gives the *Presbyterian* Party now for this Indulgence? Are they not troublesome as ever, both in their Writings, and Contrivements? That Declaration was no sooner publick, but a Petition was exhibited from divers Ministers in and about *London*, for more Liberty, with some formalities indeed of Gratitude for That. How many bold and scandalous Invectives since that time, both from the Press, and Pulpit against the Rites of the Church, and the Episcopall Clergy. Nay, and against the Sacred Majesty of That very Person, to whose Incomparable Clemency they owe their Heads and Fortunes: One Observation here; To shew, that only severity can work upon this Faction; *The single imprisonment of Crofton hath quieted that Party more than all the multiply'd, and transcendent Mercies of His Majesty.*

That worthy Gentleman in his Epistle Dedicatory to the *Liturgical Considerator* tells us, that [*The Common-Prayer-book hath been expell'd by a Lawful Authority.*] (referring to an Ordinance of January 3. 1644.) If this be not *Treason*, then *Scot* and *Peters* were no *Traitors*, that pleaded that Authority. The *Considerator* further assures us, Page 34. [*That very few Christians, that know the Power of Godliness, care for meddling with the Liturgy.*] I hope His Majesty may pass for one of these *Few*.

A great Assertor of his Principles, is the Author of the *Covenanters Plea*, although in some Respects more plausibly couch'd; in others Bolder; treating His Majesty with a most unpardonable Insolence, and with a suitable regard, all his Episcopall Friends as they fall in his way. I should exceedingly wonder how he escap'd a Lash from the last Convention, especially Dedicating that reverend Piece to the *Commons* then Assembled, did I not consider, that Those very Pamphlets whereof His Majesty complains in His Declaration touching *Ecclesiastical Affairs*, were by my self, at their first coming forth delivered to several Members of that Session, which notwithstanding, they were still sold in the Hall; all the Interest I had being too little to get them suppressed. But now return we to our Author who complains, that,

The

The Presbyterians are loaded with many Calumnies; as that they are against the Interest of Civil Magistracy, especially of Monarchy, that they are giddy, factious, schismatical, domineering, and what not? Pag. 41.

But no such matter he assures us, for They yield unto the Supreme Magistrate a Supreme political power in all spiritual matters, but they do not yield that he is the Fountain of spiritual power, there being a spiritual power belonging to the Church, if there were no Christian Magistrate in the world. They assert only a spiritual power over the Conscience, as intrinsically belonging to the Church; and acknowledge, that no Decree nor Canon of the Church can be a binding Law to the Subjects of any Kingdom under temporal penalties, till it be ratified by the Legislative power of that Kingdom. And they do not claim for the Convocation, or any other Ecclesiastical Convention, an Independency on Parliaments; if they did, surely the Parliament of England would resent such a Claim, Pag. 42.

Neither are they Anti-monarchical. Pa. 44. Did the English or Scottish Presbyters ever go about to dissolve Monarchy, and to erect some other kind of Government? In no wise: for in the solemn League and Covenant they bound themselves to endeavour the preservation of the Kings Person and Authority, and declared they had no intent to diminish His Majesties just power and greatness, Pag. 45. How far their Principles comport with the Interest of Civil Magistracy or Monarchy shall have a place by it self: yet I might very well content my self with what arises from his own words, as they lye here before us; to Prove what he Denies: for in the same Breath he both starts the Question, and Resolves it. Did not the English and Scottish Presbyters go about to dissolve Monarchy? What is the Analysis of Monarchy, but a Government by a Single Person? (and as I take it, the Injur'd Father of our present Sovereign was That Person to whom of Right the Regal Dignity belonged.) Did not these Presbyters, he talks of, place the Supreme Power in the Two Houses, and under Their Commission seize the Kings Towns, and Forts; Levy Arms; Tax the People; Plunder, and Kill their Fellow-Subjects; Impose Oaths, Share His Majesties Revenues; Perseue, and Jewishly Sell and Betray His Sacred Person? If to do all this, not only Without, but expressly Against the Kings Commission, be not to go about to dissolve Monarchy, I know not what is. Or if the Gentleman had rather dispute the Royal Prerogative, than confess his own Mistake in this Particular,

Presbytery
Anti-monarchical.


we'll

we'll look a little that Way too: but I doubt the Prospect will be none of the pleasantest.

Upon the Tryal of Cook and Peters, This was Delivered for Law. See the Narrative, Page 182, and 183.

It is the Law of this Nation, That no One House, nor Both Houses of Parliament have any Coercive power over the King: — That the Imprisoning of the King is Treason. And a little further, Thus: The King of England is one of those Princes who hath an Imperial Crown. What's That? It is not to do what he will; No, but it is that he shall not be punished in his own Person, if he doth That which is in it self Unlawful.

The two Houses have no Coercive Power over the King.

This is a short, and clear Decision of the Case: nor will it serve his turn to argue their Integrity, from what they were bound to by their Covenant and Declaration. It matters not what they *Profess'd*, but what they *Did*. If this be all they have to say; some Heads are now upon the City Gates, that said as much. What was the Covenant, but a Popular Sacrament of Religious Disobedience, a Mark of Discrimination, who were against the King, and who were for him? And this the Marquess of Montros's soon found, who being at first unwarily engaged in it, with the Kirk-party, quickly perceived his error, and retired, Living and Dying the Honour of his Nation and of the Royal Cause. Mark this, * **His Loyalty was charged upon him at his Death for Breach of Covenant.** 

The Covenant an Oath of Confederacy.

The Presbyterian Casuists would fain persuade the Nation to think themselves obliged by that Engagement. Who Understands it first? (And certainly we cannot be bound to do we know not what) Next, 'tis Impossible either to Keep, or Break it: 'tis made up of so many Contradictions. But Once for All; there is a Nullity in the Institution. No man can oblige himself in things wherein he is subject, without leave from his superiour: And again, The Oath of one who is under the power of Another, without the others consent, is neither Lawful nor Obligatory. Thus the Reverend, and Learned, Bishop Sanderfon. Now to my Presbyterian again.

The Covenant neither lawful nor binding.

After the violent change of Government; they came slowest and entered latest into those new Engagements imposed by the Usurped Powers, and some utterly refused, even to the forfeiture of their preferments, and the hazard of their livelihoods, when the Nation in general submit to the yoke; and many of those who thus object against them, did in temporizing run with the foremost. The truth is, the generality of Conscientious Presbyterians never ran with the current of those times. Some more eminent among them, Ministers and others, hazarded their lives, and others lost their lives, in combining to bring our Sovereign that now is to the rightful possession of this his Kingdom. And those in Scotland adventured no more than all to uphold him; and when he lost the Day, they lost their Liberty, and when he Fell, it was said by the Adversary, *Presbytery was fallen*, Pag. 44.

Where I must either leave the Story foul on the Kings side, or prove it so on the Other, my choice is pardonable: but otherwise, I shall be very tender of Involving the *Honest Presbyterians*, with the *Guilty*. That many of them lov'd His Majesty, and suffered for him, I will not question; and that they all submitted most unwillingly, to that *Violent Change* here mentioned, I do as little doubt. But I must needs say, the Action had been Nobler, and the Loyalty much Cleerer, had they consulted the Kings security, before they lost their own.

This does not yet oblige me to the same Charity for the *Scottish Party*; who first, during a Treaty with His Majesty, basely and brutishly murdered *Montrose*, and after that, treated the King himself, more like a Prisoner, than a Prince.

He urges, that *The Presbyterians first divided, and then dissipated the Sectarian Party, and so made way for His Majesties return in Peace*, Pag. 45. *Lambert*, and his Nine Worthies, did as much. I do believe him too, *That the sence of the Covenant quickened many mens Consciences in their Allegiance to the King*, Pag. 46. so did the Cock crowing, mind St. Peter of the denial of his Master. But he went out, and wept bitterly: So does not every Body. Alas, alas, the Saints have no faults; what should they weep for? *It may be peradventure said, the Presbyterians would enervate Monarchy: but surely* (says our Discourser) *I cannot find the rise of this Objection, unless from hence, that they were not willing to come under any yoke but that of the Laws of the Realm, or to pay Arbitrary Taxes levied without consent of Parliament.* Ibid.

From hence, these two Deductions; First, that the Subject's free from that which binds the King, namely, the *Yoke of Law*. Suppose He breaks that Law, by what Law can we question him? At best, 'tis but to punish one Transgression by Another. The *Second Hint* is Dis-ingenuous: as if *Arbitrary Taxes* had been the subject of the Difference. All the world knows, before a blow was strook, the King had stripp'd Himself of His *Honour*, and His *Conscience*, to gratifie His People. But 'twas the *Government* they aim'd at; and that they fought for. Here is yet another gentle flipp. What are *Taxes to Presbytery*? But this is a Devil that will hardly be kept within his Circle. Just so in their Practices do they reduce all Civil Actions, under the Cognizance of their Courts of Conscience, as he brings here by head and shoulders, *Arbitrary Taxes, to Matter of Religion*.

I confess (says he Pag. 46.) *There are none that more reverence their Liberties, and value the native happiness of the free-born Subjects of England. And verily their true knowledge and sense of the nature of Christian Religion makes a due freedom exceeding precious: For this Religion is not variable according to the will of man, but grounded upon an unchangeable and eternal truth, and doth indispensibly bind every Soul high and low to one Divine Law and Rule perpetual and unalterable. And therefore doth strongly plead the expedience of a due Civil Liberty on the behalf of its Professors; yet such a liberty as will not infectible Monarchy, nor the legal power of the Kings of England.*

Truly I think I have not seen words so well put together that that signifie so little. *Because Religion is not variable, but grounded upon an unchangeable and eternal Truth, &c.*—Therefore the Professours of it must have a due Civil Liberty, &c. Is not a Due Liberty, Due to all people? Again, *What is Civil Liberty to matter of salvation?* And yet again. Why should the Presbyterians challenge that Liberty to themselves, which they refuse to others, upon the very same Plea: and not rather submit their Discipline to the Law, than stoop the Law to their Discipline? There is a Liberty which is a Cloak for Maliciousness: and I am much afraid, *Theirs* and *that* are a kinn. One thing is very notable: they never state what they would have, their terms are general, and indefinite, hard to be understood, because they are resolv'd not to be satisfied. *A Due Freedom, a Due Civil Liberty, The Legal Power.* What means all this, but any thing they shall be pleas'd to make of it?

A King ruling a free People (says he, Pag. 47.) *hath a power much*

much more noble, and more free, than he that ruleth over perfect Vassals, that have no Propriety. The Power is more noble, because it hath a more noble subject of Government; it is more honourable to rule Men than Beasts, and Free men than Slaves. Likewise the power is more free: For whatsoever Prince hath not his power limited by his peoples legal freedom, he will be bound up some other way, either by the potency of subordinate Princes, and great Lords within the Realm, or by a veterane Army, as the Turkish Emperour by his Janizaries, and the Roman Cæsars by the Pretorian Bands and the Legions. Upon which account, to be powerfull Monarch over a free people is the freedom and glory of our Sovereign Lord, above all the Potentates on earth.

A King ruling a free people, is a Kind of Presbyterianism, and sounds better in the mouth of a Lawyer, than of a Divine. The Correlate to Rule, is Subjection: nor will their Title to a Propriety, yet justify the common usage of the Term. 'Tis of a dangerous Intimation, and seems to give the people more than comes to their share. (I speak with reverence to the Benignity of our English Laws, and the Indubitable right which every Subject hath to the Benefits thereof) That it is more honourable to rule Free men, than Slaves, is but a Complement. For I can make those Slaves, Free, when I please, whereas the other way my power's confin'd; That is, in Equity, a Prince is bound to observe the Law, as his own Act: and if he fails, the people may compel him to it, if they can shew a Law for't. To end this point: What Prince soever shall suffer every bubling Brain to controvert the bounds of King and Subject; the Royal Authority, and the Peoples Freedom; that Prince I say, runs a great hazard of his Sovereignty. The very moving of the Question, is to prophane the Sacredness of Majesty: and by degrees begets irreverent and sawcy habits in the People.

But Rebellion (he tells us) and Disobedience is the loud out-cry of some against this party. And this were a crying sin indeed: But let not sober minds be hurried into prejudice by such exclamations and out-cries. It were to be wished, for common peace and amity, that the late publick discords were eternally forgotten. But seeing some in these times of expected Reconciliation will not cease to implead and condemn the honest minded, and render them odious to the higher powers, a necessity is laid upon us to speak something Apologetical, at least to mitigate the business and remove prejudice. Pag 48.

Sure this loud out-cry of Rebellion, and Disobedience, comes from within himself; for truly I have a little watch'd the Press; and since

since his Majesties Return, (nay a good while before) upon my Conscience, I have not met with one syllable of bitterness against that party, but *Defensive*: Yet I dare undertake to produce forty Presbyterian Pamphlets, and Discourses, of fresh date, exceeding foul against the King, and his Adherents. It really makes me blush, and tremble to consider how great a mercy they abuse, how sad a vengeance they provoke. Had but these people the least spark of *natural Affection*, and *Remorse*, the venerable ruins of a glorious Church and State would work upon them; Or now and then a thought how matters stand betwixt God and their Souls. But their great care of others, makes them neglect themselves, and become *true Anathema's* for a pretended *publick Good*. However, they do well to cry Whore first; and call that a *Necessitated Apology*, which seems to me, a palpable, and causeless Slander.

*Presbyterians
seditious and
impenitent.*

We have heard much & often of the Presbyterians *Loyalty* and *Religion*: we'll look a little now into their *Law*; which very fairly gives us to understand, that the *Unbishoping of Timothy and Titus*, will not do their trick. They are at work already upon the two main Props of Royalty; the Kings *Negative Voice*; and the *Power of the Sword*. A blessed Age the while, when the *Pulpit* shall pretend to dispose of the *Crown*, carve out the *Government*: and every scribbling *Cloak-Divine* vent his seditious and crude *Politiques* to the People. But now it works.

The Presbyterian party in England never engaged under a less Authority than that of both Houses of Parliament. I have read that the Parliament of England hath several capacities, and among the rest, these two; First, that it represents the People as Subjects, and so it can do nothing but manifest their grievances, and petition for relief. Secondly, that by the constitution it hath part in the Sovereignty, and so it hath part in the Legislative Power, and in the final Judgment. Now when as a part of the Legislative Power resides in the two Houses, as also a Power to redress grievances, and to call into question all Ministers of State and Justice, and all Subjects of whatsoever degree in case of Delinquency, it might be thought that a part of the supreme power doth reside in them, though they have not the honorary Title, Pag. 49.

Methinks we should do well to leave calling the two Houses, the Parliament of England, having already pay'd so dear for that mistake. By the Power of the Parliament of England, is Intended the King in Parliament.

*The two Houses
not the Parliam-
ent.*

But then an *Argument* is imply'd ; neither *King*, *Lords*, nor *Commons*; nor any two of them, can pretend to a Parliamentary Authority, without the *Third*, This is not to suppose *Co-ordination* neither. The *Two Houses* are still *Subjects*: Their Office being only *Consultive*, or *Preparatory*. The Character of *Power* rests in the *Final Sanction*, and that's the *Kings*: So that effectually, the passing of a *Bill*, is but the *granting of a Request*. So much for *Parliament*, in propriety of speaking. Now to the *Power* of the two Houses, (by my Antagonist mis-called, the *Parliament*, of *England*,) upon which Bottom stands the Presbyterian Fabrick.

He tells us, they Act in *Two capacities*. As *Subjects*, or *Petitioners*, first: and Then, as *Sharers* of the *Sovereignty*. That is, they are sent to *Ask* what they *List*, and *Take* what they *Pleaze*. The *Petitioning Capacity* is not for the Presbyterians purpose; wherefore he waves That, and sticks to the Other. What their *Power* is, will best appear from the *Kings Writ of Summons*, which both *Commands* and *Limits* them, *Pro QUIBUSDAM arduis, & urgentibus negotiis*, &c. *ORDINAVIMUS* &c. He states it otherwise, and Places a *Part of the Legislative Power in the Two Houses*; which

The Legislative Power in the King.

is not Doctor-like. For the *Legislative Power* is totally the *Kings*. They do but make the *Bill*, He makes the *Law*; 'Tis the *Stamp*, not the *Matter* makes it current. Nor do I comprehend what he can mean by *part of the Legislative power*: to my thinking, he might as well have said *Part of an Indivisible Point*. This will come to a pretty Fraction, Two Thirds of a Parliament, shall make Two Thirds of a Law. Is it not enough, that the King can do nothing without the Two Houses, unless they may do every thing without the King? Grant this, and of all People living we are the greatest Slaves, as of all Constitutions ours is the most Ridiculous.

Touching the *Power of the Two Houses*, to Redresse Grievances, and Question all Ministers of State and Justice, The Power they have,

The two Houses no Court of Judicature

is either from Prescription, or Commission. To the former, I think Few will pretend; and to the Latter, None. Never was the House of Commons, at any hand reputed a Court of Justice. They cannot give an Oath, Impose a Fine: nor indeed exercise an Empire but over their own Members. 'Tis true, the Lords House, hath in some Cases a Right of Judicature; but Clayming by Prescription, they are likewise limited by Custom.

Further;

Further ; Both Houses are no Court of Judicature, and (with due Reverence to his Majesty) the King himself in Parliament, joyn'd with the Three Estates, claim not a Right of Judication, but very rarely , and with great Tenderneſs. It is the proper Buſineſs of a Parliament to *make Lawes, Alter, or Repeal* them ; not to *Interpret* them;unleſſe in matters of very great Importance. That's left to the Judges ; and to determine of their Validity. For Acts of Parliament, either *Repugnant* in themſelves or of *impoſſible Suppoſition* ; or againſt *Common-Right*, are deem'd not Binding. The Common, and moſt ſpecious ſhift of all the reſt, is,that the *Government of this Nation is in King, Lords and Commons*. This muſt be ſwallowed with great waryneſs, or 'twill choak halfe the Nation. By the KING, *Architectonick*, and by the other TWO, *Organick*, (as Walker diſtinguiſhes it) the King , as the *Architect*, and the two Houses, as his *Inſtruments*. If there were neither *Practiſe, Law*, nor *Interſeſt* in the Caſe, methinks the very oddes of Honour in the Deputation, ſhould be Enough to carry it. The King is God's Representative ; They are but the *Peoples*.

Say I ſhould now admit them all they challenge,(as delegated by the People) ſo tickle is the point yet, that if any one ſingle Perſon of the Number, ſhould be illegally debarr'd the Freedom of his Vote; that nicety, avoyds, and nulls the Whole Proceeding. I can hardly think any thing clearer, than the errour of placing *part of the Supream power in the two Houses*, it implyes a Contradiſtion. A *part* of a Thing (with leave) *impartible*. But Drowning men will catch at Straws. However, I perceive, that his *Majeſties beſt Friends*, and the *Church's*, (as they ſtile themſelves) are reſolved to ſerve both *King and Biſhops* alike. That is, juſt as the Biſhop is to rule in *Conſociation* with his Presbyters, ſo ſhall his Majesty with his *Fellow Princes*, the Presbyterian Members. It cannot but exceedingly diſpoſe the King to grant Theſe People all DUE LIBERTY, that will give Him ſo much. Crowns are but Troubleſome ; and Government ſits heavy upon the Shoulders of a Single Perſon ; They'll eaſe him of that Care, and Weight: and for the *honor of their Prince and their Countries good*, divide the Glorious Load, among themſelves. *This being paſt*, (which Heaven avert) *we may* (ſayes the Late King, *Exact Coll.* 316) *be wayted on Bare headed, we may have our Hand kiſſ'd, the Style of Majeſty continued to us, and the Kings Authority, declared by*

Presbyters
ſerve King
and Biſhops
alike

both

both Houses of Parliament, may be still the stile of your Commands ; we may have Swords, and Maces carried before us, & please our Self with sight of a Crown and Scepter — But see how the Man relents ; and tells us, (though the Law sayes the King can do no wrong, that This part of the Supreme power, is indeed capable of doing wrong, yet how it might be Guilty of Rebellion, is more difficult to conceive. Pag. 49.

Put case the two Houses should take up Arms against the King, beause he will not Banish the one half of his Friends, and hang up the rest : would not that be Rebellion ? I could start twenty Suppositions more ; but I'll stop here : and the rather, beause our Author professes, that *[in this high and tender point it belongs not to him to Determine.]* Yet he goes on, and certainly believes that the World is divided into *Fools* and *Presbyterians* ; he would not otherwise have thrust upon us so gross a Juggle, as that which I am now about to examine.

Touching the much debated point (says he, Pag. 50.) of resisting the Higher Powers, without passing any Judgement in the great Case of England, I shall only make rehearsal of the words of Grotius a man of renown ; and known to be neither *Antimonarchical*, nor *Antiprelatical*, which are found in his Book *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, by himself dedicated to the French King. *Si Rex partem habeat summi Imperii, partem alteram Populus aut Senatus, Regi in partem non suam involanti, vis justa opponi poterit, quia eatenus Imperium non habet. Quod locum habere censeo, etiamsi dictum sit, Belli potestatem penes Regem fore. Id enim de Bello externo intelligendum est, cum alioqui quisquis Imperii summi partem habeat, non possit non jus habere eam partem tuendi.* lib. I. c. 4. §. 13.

Here we find Grotius cited, to justify that the Presbyterians Lords and Commons may make War against the Loyalty. King to defend their Title to the Supream Power. Pythagoras his Opinion concerning Wild Fowl, had been as much to the purpose. For the English Readers sake, I'll turn it ; and in this point desire a more than ordinary attention. Where the Supremacy is in the King, in some Cases ; and in Others, in the People, or Senate. That King invading the Others Right, may be lawfully resisted ; for his Power reaches not so far. And this I think will stand good, although I have already placed the right of making War, in the King ; for that must be understood of a Foreign War : Since who-soever hath a part of the Supream Power, hath consequently a right of maintaining

maintaining such part as he hath. There is one line yet remaining, which our Author hath very prudently kept for a Reserve, till the Presbyterians shall have gotten the better of the King. *Quod ubi fit, potest Rex etiam suam, Imperii partem belli jure amittere.* That is, *Where thus it happens the Kings encroachment upon the Peoples Right, may fairly amount to a forfeiture of his own.* Is it not pity that people of these mild, and complying principles, should be charg'd with *Disobedience*? If this be the Case of *England*, the Question is no longer, the *Presbyterians Liberty*, but the *Kings Title to his Crown*.

That Chapter of *Grotius*, whence he takes his Quotation, treats *De Bello Subditorum, in Superiores; Where, and where not, Subjects may take up Arms against their Superiours.* This learned man, among other Cases, tells us, in this they may, and the Reason is evident: For where the Sovereignty is thus disposed; half to the King, half to the people, that Prince is but a *Subject* to some purposes, a *King* to others. So that in any point of Sovereignty, formally vested in the people; He is not their Superiour, but they his. How finely he hath match'd the Case of *England*, where Kings have no Restraint, but what they put upon themselves? for the Laws are their proper Acts. But mark the Process of his Reasonings: and how (in his own Phrase) *he feels his way step by step.* [*The Presbyterians were ever in the right*] he says. Why, if he would be quiet, who says the contrary? But then the King was in the wrong. To bring the Case up to *Grotius* his determination: we must admit; *First*, that by the constitution of *England*, the Sovereignty is shared betwixt the King and the two Houses: and *Next*, that the late King did Actually invade the Popular Prerogative: from whence arises the lawfulness of resistance; and after that, *Potest Rex etiam suam Imperii partem Belli jure amittere.* They have at last the same right to the Crown, they had at first to the Quarrel. He that peruses the first eight Sections of the forementioned Chapter, will find *Grotius* no favourer of his opinions that quotes him. Be the Prince what he will, he tells us, *Summum Imperium tenentibus resisti jure non posse.* Bodin yet more expressly, that *England and Scotland are absolute Monarchies.* That the Supream Power is only in the King. (*Jura Majestatis, ac Imperii summam, in unius Principis, Arbitrio versari.* Further, *In Senatu nullum est Imperium*; Nor only so; but whoever

Bodin de Rep.
lib.2. cap.5.

De Repub. lib.
1. cap. 8. Lib.
3. cap 1. Ibid.

urges

urges the contrary, meditates a Commotion. *Isti qui Imperium Senatui tribuunt, Republicæ interim, ac status everſionem moluntur.*

As to the point of Loyalty now in question, the ſubverſion of the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom could not be effected, till thoſe Members of Parliament that were Presbyterian were many of them Impriſoned, others forcibly ſecluded by the violence of the Army, and the reſt thereupon withdrew from the Houſe of Commons, Pag. 51.

Then it ſeems till that Violence by the Army, upon the Presbyterians, there was none Acted by the Presbyterians upon the King. To ſeize his Towns and Magazines; Hunt, and Aſſault His Royal Perſon; Part His Revenues; Hang up His Friends: All this is juſtify'd, in Caſe His Maſteſty reſuſes to be rul'd by His Two Houſes. Alas, the Fundamental Government was ſafe, (I warrant ye) ſo long as the Rights of Sovereignty were exercis'd, firſt by the Aſſembly in Scotland, and then by a pack'd Party, in a Cloſe Committee: And the Presbyterians nevertheleſs Honeſt men for ſelling the King firſt; Then voting him a Priſoner; and after that, for Pinching him even upon the very point of Preſbytery. Surely they are much to blame that charge theſe Innocents with Diſloyalty.

If the Presbyterian Members had not been Forced (they ſay) All had been well. Truly it may be ſo; yet if I miſtake not, there was a time when the Episcopcal Members were Forced too: and had that Violence been ſpared, it had never come to This. But I ſuppoſe, the City-tumults againſt BISHOPS: the Outcryes of the Rabble at White-hall: the Multitudes that Bawl'd for Reformation: Poſting up ſuch and ſuch for Staffordians, as honeſtly oppoſed the Torrent of the People. This in the Well-affected, paſſes for Chriſtian Liberty. But our Divine Machiavel follows his Opinion with a Proof.

For they (ſays he, meaning the Presbyterians) had Voted the Kings Conceſſions a Ground ſufficient for the Houſes to proceed to ſettle the Nation, and were willing to caſt whatever they Contended for, upon a Legal Security, Pag. 51.

Waving their Former Vote of Non-Addreſſes, and that foul Declaration of their Reaſons for it: We will in Charity believe, they were over-aw'd, and that it was extorted by the Army. But what excuſe for the matter of the Propoſitions? That they were Actuated by a Presbyterian Spirit, appears in This, that they demanded Settlement of a Presbyterian Government. It remains

mains now only from Hence to gather the Fair Equivalence, of this Gentleman's Doctrine, and to discover what 'tis the Presbyterian Faction calls a *Legal Security*.

They hold, that if the King of *England* will not comply with the Two Houses, the People may *Chase, Sequester, and Imprison* him: and when they have him in Distress, they may without Disloyalty press him to these, or the like Conditions for his Liberty.

First, *By a Publick Act to justifie that Violence, and condemn himself.* Presbyterian Positions.

2ly. *To Renounce and Abolish Episcopacy, although bound by Oath and Judgment to defend it.*

3ly. *To transfer the Right of Levying Men, and Monies, to the Two Houses; by them to be Raised and Disposed of at Pleasure, without rendring any Accompt to His Majesty.*

4ly. *To deliver up the Lives, Liberties, and Fortunes of all that served Him, to the Mercy of That Party.*

5ly. *To grant that all Offices of Trust may be disposed of by the Appointment of Both Houses.*

This is a short, and modest Accompt of Presbyterian Loyalty, the *Due Liberty* they contend for: which being settled upon a *Legal Security*, with such further *Concessions*, as their Modesty shall vouchsafe to require, puts an end to the Dispute. His late Majesty observes (upon *Uxbridge Treaty*) That it was a grand *Maxime* with them, always to ask something, which in Reason, and Honour must be denied, that they might have some colour to refuse all that was in other things granted. So we find it. But what's the Reason of this peevishness?

Is there any thing in the Nature of Prelacy that frames the mind to Obedience and Loyalty? Or is there any thing in Presbytery, that inclines to Rebellion and Disobedience? Pag. 52. Truly I think there is. Prelacy holds a better proportion in the Scale of Order, as a more Regular Subordination of Duties and Relations. Nature and Providence do not move by Leaps, but by Insensible and Soft Degrees, which give Stability and Beauty to the Universe. Is not the World compos'd of Disagreements, Hot and Cold, Heavy and Light? And yet we see those Oppositi-

Prelacy a more orderly Constitution than Presbytery.

ons are by the means of middle, and Conciliating mixtures wrought into a Compliance? 'Tis the same Case in *Subject* and *Superiour*. *Higher* and *Lower*, betwixt *Top* and *Bottom*, are but as several Links of one Providential Chain, where every Individual, by vertue of this mutual Dependency contributes to the Peace, and Benefit of the Whole: some are below *Me*: and This sweetens the Thought that I am below *Others*: By which Libration are prevented those Distempers which arise either from the Affectation of more Power, or the Shame of having none at all. As these *Degrees* of *Mean*, and *Noble*, are beyond doubt of Absolute necessity, to Political Concord; so possibly the Closer the Remove, The better yet, as to the point of Social Expedience; provided, that the Distances be such as to avoid Confusion, and preserve Distinct Offices, and Powers from enterfering. Nor is this Gradual method only suited to Humane Interest, as being most accommodate to Publick Quiet, and to defend the Sacredness of Majesty from Popular Distempers: but 'tis the very Rule which God himself Imposes upon the whole Creation: *making of the same Lump, one Vessel to Honor, and another to dishonor*, Rom. 9. 21. Subjecting by the Law of his own Will, *This to That: That*, to what's next *above* it: *Both to a further Power, All to Himself*. And here we Rest: as at the Fountain of Authority. From God, *Kings* Reign; They appoint their *Substitutes*, and so on, to inferiour Delegations; *All Powers derive from a Divine Original*.

This Orderly Gradation, which we find in Prelacy must needs beget a Reverence to Authority; the Hierarchy it self depending upon a Principle of Obedience, whereas our Utopian Presbytery advances it self upon a Level of Confusion. It is a kind of Negative Faction, united to dissolve a laudable and settled frame of Government, that they may afterward set up they know not what. We may have learn'd thus much from late and sad experience: let him that would know more of it, read *the Survey of pretended Holy Discipline*. I think it would be hard to shew one eminent Presbyterian, that stickles not for an Aristocracy in the State, as well as in the Church: and he that said *No Bishop, No Ruler*, gave a shrewd Judgment; not as implying a Princes absolute dependence upon Bishops, but in effect, the King's Authority is wounded through the Church; the Reformation of what is amiss, belonging to the *Ruler*, not to the *People*. I do not yet condemn all *Presbyters*, nor justify all *Prelates*.

We are told, *that in ancient times, and for a series of many ages, the Kings of England have had tedious conflicts with Prelates, in their Dominions*, Pag. 53. 'Tis right, and the same cause is now espoused by our more than Papal Presbyterians; to wit, Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over the Civil Power. But we are further Question'd.

If Presbytery and Rebellion be connatural, how comes it to pass, that those States or Kingdoms where it hath been established or tolerated, have for any time been free from broyls and commotions? Pag. 53. It is as true that those places have been quietest, where Presbytery hath gain'd footing, as 'tis, *that Presbyterians have never disclaim'd, or abandon'd their Lawful Prince: that they have never ceased to sollicite, and supplicate his Regards, and Favour, even when Their power hath been at the highest, and His sunk lowest.* Ibid.

This is something which in good manners wants a name. How far the Presbyterians have *abandon'd* their Prince, I shall not press, but rather refer the Reader to examine how far, and in what manner they have *Sollicited* him. (*Cujus contrarium.*)

His late Majesty, after forty Messages for Peace, and a *Personal Treaty*, finding himself most barbarously laid aside; in a *Declaration from Carisbrook Castle, Dated Janu. 18. 1647.* Expostulates the matter in these Terms.

Now would I know, what it is that is desired: *Reliquiæ sacræ Carolina. Pag. 158.*
Is it Peace? I have shewed the way (being both willing and desirous to perform my part in it) which is, a just Compliance with all chief Interests.
Is it Plenty and Happines? They are the inseparable effects of Peace; Is it Security? I, who wish that all Men would forgive and forget like me, have offer'd the Militia for my time.
Is it Liberty of Conscience? He who wants it, is most ready to give it.
Is it the right Administration of Justice? Officers of trust are committed to the choice of my two Houses of Parliament.
Is it frequent Parliaments? I have legally, fully concurr'd therewith.
Is it the Arriers of the Army? Upon settlement, they will certainly be paid, with much ease; but before, there will be found much difficulty, if not impossibility in it.

Thus all the World cannot but see my real and unwearied endeavours for Peace, the which (by the grace of God) I

shall neither repent me of, nor ever be slackened in: Notwithstanding my past, present, or future sufferings; But, if I may not be heard, let every one judge, who it is that obstructs, the Good I would do, or might do.

Where the right lies, a Presbyterian may better Determine, than a Royalist Question.

—*Magno se iudice quisque tuetur.*

Here's the Testimony of a Pedant in Ballance against the Authority of a Prince.

He tells us, by and by, that *Prophaneness, Intemperance, Revelings, Outrages, and filthy Lewdness were not at any time in the memory of the present Age, held under more Restraint, than in the late distracted times, by means of a Practical Ministry, Pag. 55.*

These Generals spell nothing, and to name Particulars were not so candid; I could else make up *Scot and Peters*, at least a score, even out of the select Tribe of the Reformers: (and these I think are not as yet Canonized for Saints.)

'Tis no Prophaness (is it?) to play the Hocus Pocus in a Pulpit, with Rings, and Bodkins; to talk Treason by Inspiration; and entitle the Holy Ghost to Murder and Rebellion. To appoint Mock Fasts, and thank God for Victories he never gave them. To swear for, and against the King, in the same breath; to convert Churches into Stables, and for fear of Superstition, to commit Sacrilege.

Nor is it Out-rage sure, or Intemperance, to seize the Patrimony of the Church, the Kings Revenues; Pillage and Kill their Fellow Subjects. To set up Ordinances against settled Laws, and subject the Ten Commandments to the superiour Vote of a Committee. To justify Tumults against Authority, and suffer the most damnable Heresies to scape without reproof. But what if there were Disorders; by whom were they Caused?

It is most unreasonable to object, that the late wild postures, extravagancies and incongruities in Government, were the work of Presbytery or Presbyterians. The Nation had never proof of Presbytery, for it was never settled, but rather decried and exposed to prejudice by those that were in sway, and that in the more early times of the late Wars. Pag. 59.

I must confess indeed, that *Presbytery* was never settled, nor ever likely to be; so much did the whole Nation stomach it; But

But yet how this agrees with his former Reasoning, *Pag. 29.* I do not understand. There, he pretends, that *by long practice mens minds are fix'd in this opinion* : and that the party is *numerous*. Here he contents himself to acknowledge, that the Presbyterians lost their power early, and that they never recovered it since. This will not serve his turn, to acquit the Faction (so denominated) of our late Miseries. Our Sovereign (of blessed memory) brings the contest down, *to his surprizal at Holmby, and the Distractions in the two Houses, the Army, and the City, ensuing upon it. These* (says that excellent Prince) *are but the struglings of those Twins, which lately one Womb enclosed, the Younger striving to prevail against the Elder* **what the Presbyterians have hunted after, the Independents now seek to catch for themselves.* In fine; One finish'd what the Other began; for the King dyed at last, but of those wounds which he at first received in his Authority. His Majesty upon his leaving Oxford, and going to the Scots, clears this yet further : where he calls it, *Adventuring upon their Loyalty, who first began his Troubles.*

The truth of this matter (says he, *Pag. 58.*) *is cleared by a passage of our late Sovereign, in a Letter to His Majesty that now is. [All the lesser Factions were at first officious Servants to Presbytery their great Master, till time and Military Success discovering to each their particular advantages, invited them to part stakes, and leaving the joynt stock of uniform Religion, pretended each to drive for their Party the Trade of profits and preferments, to the breaking and undoing not only of the Church and State, but of Presbytery it self. — (It follows) * which seem'd, and hoped at first to have engross'd all.*

The last line is as true as any of the rest ; but all truths are not to be spoken. Indeed this Slip is somewhat with the grossest. Not to trouble my self with their formal Fopperies, of *Deacons, Elders,* and their *Parish-meetings* ; Those are but popular amusements : We'll pass to what's more pertinent, and see how he acquits his Friends of joyning with the Independents. *The truth is* (says he, *Pag. 60.*) *Sectarianism grew up in a Mystery of Iniquity and State-policy, and it was not well discerned, till it became almost triumphant by Military successes.*

'Tis a strange thing the Presbyterians should not see what they they themselves contrived; what all others took notice of; and what the late King offer'd to prove [*In his Declaration of August the 12th. 1642.*] The Insolence of Sectaries being not only wink'd at, but publickly avow'd; and the Law thwarted to protect them. See what one says, (no stranger to their Practices) to prove, and evidence the Combination.

*Exact Collecti-
ons. Pag. 531.*

*History of In-
dependency.
Page 1.*

Page 2.

*The Leading-men, or Grandees first divided them-
selves into two Factions, or Juntoes; Presbyterians,
and Independents: seeming to look only at the Church,
but they involv'd the Interests of the Common-wealth.
—These having seemingly divided themselves, and
having really divided the Houses, and captivated
their Respective Parties Judgment; —Teaching them by an impli-
cite Faith, Jurare in verba Magistrum, To pin their Opinions upon their
sleeves: they begin to advance their projects of monopolizing the Profits,
Preferments, and Power, of the Kingdom in themselves. To which
purpose, though the Leaders of each Party seem to maintain a hot op-
position, yet when any profit or preferment is to be reached at, it is ob-
served that a powerful Independent especially, moves for a leading Pres-
byterian, or a leading Presbyterian for an Independent: and seldom doth
one oppose or speak against another, in such Cases, unless somewhat of
particular Spleen or Competition come between: which causeth them to
break the Common-rule. By this means the Grandees of each Faction,
seldom miss their Mark, since an Independent moving for a Presbyterian,
his Reputation carries the Business clear with the Independent Party:
and the Presbyterians will not oppose a Leading man of their own side.
I find we are not like to Agree, for these People cannot see
their own Faults, nor we their Virtues. I would take a good
Journey to meet any man stiff in that Way, that would but Con-
fess he was ever in any Error.*

*Of all the prejudices and scandals taken against this way, (says he,
Pag. 63.) there is none greater than this, that it is represented as tyr-
annical and domineering, and that those who live under it, must (like Is-
sachar) crouch under the Burdens.*

We do indeed accompt the Presbyterian Discipline very Ty-
rannical, and by and by we'll give our Reasons for it. Not be-
cause this Discipline censures Scandalous Disorders, (as he insinua-
tes) but for that it subjects all Civil matters to a Consistorian
Cognizance, and rapt by an Impulse of Passion, calls many things
Scandalous

Scandalous, which measured by the Rule of Piety, and Reason, are found Praise-worthy, and of laudable Example. The usage of the Common-Prayer-book, is to *Them, Scandalous*, though settled by the Law: but to eject a Minister for Reading it, though both Without Law, and Against it; That, *They esteem no Scandal; We, the contrary.*

I have now brought the Gentleman to his first Stage, where I might very fairly leave him, for having already done my *Business*, what I do more, is but for *Company*. So far as I can judge, I have not scap'd one syllable material to his purpose: nor have I either Broken his Periods, or unlink'd his Reasonings, to puzzle, or avoid his meaning. How fairly I have dealt with what I have expos'd, whether in matter of *Fact, Deduction, or Good manners*; (the Subject of the Difference duly weigh'd) That I submit to the Reader, and where the Reason lies betwixt us.

I have indeed omitted a great part of the Debate, as not at all related to my Design, nor (to speak freely) much to the point in Question. His frequent and Rhetorical Raptures, extolling to the Heavens, the *Wisdom and Sanctity* of the *Presbyterians*; (but above all, the *Legions* of the Saints) what does this florid Vanity signify more than the putting of his own Name to a fair Picture, when yet, for ought he *proves*, and for ought we *discern*, there's not one Line betwixt them of Agreement. The contrary Course he takes with the *Prelatick Party*. They (forsooth) are *Not* so and so: and from his *Generals*, There he is pleas'd to enter into *prohibited Particulars*, taxing in *special* manner the excesses of some of our Late Prelates: but without any instances of Good in the Other Party, which does but spitefully and weakly imply, that *Bishops* have more *Faults*, than *Presbyterians* have *Virtues*. It will not be now expected, that we that *differ* in the *Premises*, should agree in the *Conclusion*. But for That we'll take our Fortunes.

Upon the whole matter foregoing, we firmly build this Position, P. 65. That the Presbyterian Party ought not in Justice or Reason of State to be rejected and depressed, but ought to be protected and encouraged. This is but one Doctors Opinion; we think otherwise; Nevertheless (says he) there being a seeming complication in this business, and an other ample Party appearing in competition, a difficulty remains, and the matter falls into a further deliberation. And thereupon we are fallen upon the second main Enquiry. Pag. 66.

II. Qu. *Whether the Presbyterian Party may be protected and encouraged, and the Episcopal not deserted or obliged.*

'Tis a Particular Grace, that the *Bishops* Party may yet be admitted into the Competition, and that the man of the *short Robe* will vouchsafe to Enquire into the *Consistence of Episcopacy and Presbytery*: yet it was boldy ventur'd to Determine what ought to be done, before he had examin'd, whether the Thing was *Feasible* or no. I shall not spend my Time to Controvert *Ideas*, and Wrangle about Governments in the Air: we are for Plain and Practicable Contrivements, such as, *Authority, Good Order, and Long Experience* have recommended to us.

I suppose the agreeing of *Both Parties* in such *Middle Terms* as he proposes, a thing not utterly Impossible. Many things may be fair enough in *Notion*, yet of exceeding hazard to be put in *Practice*; especially 'tis dangerous to try Tricks with Politique Constitutions. Great Alterations, are scarce safe, even where they are *Lawful*, and wrought with *good Intention*; Much less are those so, which are promoted by a Disorderly, and Popular Earnestness, and with *seditions Meaning*. For This I dare lay down as a *Position*: *Never did any Private Party band against a Publick Settlement, with an Intent to Mend it.*

But what have we to do with the Imaginary *Colation* of the two Church-parties; when the Kirk-Discipline affronts the Civil Sanction, and Actually invades the King's Authority? Let them first bring their Principles to their Duties, Treating like Subjects, and Submitting as Christians. Can any man believe those People Friends to the Church, that are Enemies to the State? or that the God of Order can be pleas'd with the Promoters of Confusion.

Were there no other Reason to deny the thing they ask, than their bare manner of Asking; it ought not to be Granted. What signifies their Talk of *Number, Power, Resolution*, but a False Muster of the Faction, to make a Party with the Rabble? (when yet, God knows they're Inconsiderable: let every man but overlook his Neighbour, and Count, he'll find the Disproportion.) Undoubtedly the most Insufferable of all their Arguments is that of *Danger*; there's but one step between that

Word

Word and Violence. First, it implies a Seditious Complication. They move for such as they believe will Tumult : if not, where lyes the Hazzard? Beside ; Those Subjects that dare tell their Prince, 'tis dangerous to deny their Askings ; do by that Insolence render his Concessions much more *hazzardous*. Persons of that Audacious temper, will hardly make a sober use of an extorted Bounty.

So far as *Presbyterian*, and *Episcopal*, purely refer to the Church, I shall not much concern my self in Our Resolvers *Second main Enquiry* : (Equal to all the World is the Incomparable Hooker, upon that Subject) but where these Terms are in a greater Latitude, applied to Civil matters, I shall be bold to pass some further Observations.

The Dissenting side oppose not all Liturgy, but desire that the present form may be Changed, or Reformed. Pag. 70.

That's but a Modest Motion. But now suppose, his Majesty, the Law, and Forty for One of the Nation, should desire the Continuance of it as it is : what Equity have the Dissenters to the Change, or what would be the Benefit, if granted? Not the Tenth part, even of the Presbyterians, would be contented with it. Some of them are against all set Forms of Common-Prayer whatever ; Others (more moderate forsooth) do not oppose a *Prescript Form*, so it be not *enjoyn'd*. A Third sort, will vouchsafe to permit the *English Liturgy*, provided they may have the purging of it themselves ; and when all's done the Sectaries may claim as much right to *abolish* That, as they to *alter* This. And now for Ceremonies.

They oppose not any circumstance of Decency and Order, but desire that mystical Ceremonies of Humane institution may be abolished, or not enjoined. Ibid.

First, the Dissenters are not the Judges of *Decency and Order*; and for *Mystical Ceremonies of Humane institution* ; (as Scaliger says of the *Sepia*) *Caliginem effundit, & evadit* ; he troubles the Water and escapes in the Dark.

Multiformity in Religion (says our Reconciler ; pleading for Accommodation, Pag. 73.) *publickly professed doth not well comport with the spirit of this Nation, which is free, eager, jealous, apt to animosities and jealousies, besides that it hath ever had a strong propension to Uniformity.*

Had this fallen from a Common Pen, I could have better born the Disproportion of his Character of the English Temper,

— *Free, Eager, Jealous*, and yet propence to *Uniformity*. This seems to me a mixture Impossible. But the good man means well, and writes so, when he lists. His drift is, to perswade us, that to comply with the *Presbytery*, is to comport with the *spirit of this Nation*: which being *Free*, and *Eager*, seems to Cry, *Beware*. How blessedly would these *Free-spirited* Worthies order their Subjects if they were once in Power, that thus presume from their own Level, to Menace, and Controll Authority!

If *Toleration* might compose the Difference, there were some hope, but That, alas, is more than they can afford the *Government*, and much less will they accept it for themselves. *The temper of this Kingdom* (says he) *does not well accord with extremes on either hand*, Pag. 74. and to see the Fortune of it, the *Presbyterians* are just in the *Middle*.

Toleration being not the *Daughter of Amity* but of *Enmity* (at least) in some degree supposeth the Party tolerated to be a burden, especially if conceived dangerous to the way established: and commonly holds no longer than meer necessity compels; and consequently neither party take themselves to be safe, the one alwaies fearing to lose its authority, and the other its liberty. Pag. 74.

Behold a learned Exposition, and a Dutifull. Where the party tolerated appears dangerous to the way established: the One fears to lose its Authority, and the Other its Liberty. There's no great depth in the discovery that from an Opinion of mutual Danger arises mutual Jealousie. But what's this Case to the Subject of our

Debate? By *Toleration*, is not meant an Imprudent Yielding, to an Untractable, and Churchish Faction: but a Discreet, and Pious Application of Tenderness toward such as by their Fair Comportment in the Mayn of Order, and good Manners, appear to merit it. True it is, God himself is the only Searcher of Hearts, who sees our Thoughts, even in the bed of their Conception. Yet where we find an Inconformity of Practice to Profession: People that *streyne at a Gnat, and swallow a Camel*, We may without offence to Charity rank those Incongruous Christians among *Hypocrites*: and with great Justice hold them to the Law, that strive to bring the Law down to their humours. By the same Rule ought we to judge in favour of their Scruples, whose Lives are squar'd by a conform severity and strictness.

It is most true that *such Proposals may suffice for Peace, which will not satisfy Humour and Faction, and Carnal Interest.* Pag. 76. Why do we not apply our selves then to the only Umpire of the Controversie; the Setled Law, which, without either Passion, or Design, lays down our Duty, and our Interest? These wranglings about Trifles do but enflame the Difference, and start new Animosities, instead of Quieting the Old. The great pretence of Scandal (forsooth) is this.

The Presbyterians stick at Ceremonies properly sacred, and significant by humane institution, which they conceive to be more than mere circumstances, even parts of Worship; and whatsoever instituted Worship is not ordained of God, they hold unlawfull. Pag. 84.

This Passage lyes a little out of my Rode, but however, I'll make it my way. It is much easier to call our Ceremonies *sacred* and *parts of worship*, than to prove them so. Is the manner of Doing any thing, part of the thing Done? And for *Significant by Humane Institution* the Exception is as Frivolous. Because that in *some Cases* even of External Discipline, the Church is *limited*; does it therefore follow that it is *free* in none? or ty'd up only to such Rites, and Ceremonies, as hold no signal proportion with the Reason of their Institution? This Argument cuts their own Throats, since by the signficancy of the *Sitting Posture* at the Communion, they maintain the Use of it; for (say their *Admonitioners*) *It BETOKENS Rest, and full Accomplishment of Legal Ceremonies in Christ.*

They that scruple our mystical significant Ceremonies, conceive that they are properly and meerly sacred; as having the honour of God for their direct and immediate end. Pag. 86.

These Reasonings are but Snares for Woodcocks. That the *ultimate* end of all our Actions is, (or at least ought to be) *the Honour of God*, admits no Question; but 'tis not therefore the *Immediate end* of every thing we doe, nor in particular of *Ceremonies*. The Outward Forms and Rites of Publick Worship, direct partly to *Uniformity* and *Order*; and partly to excite due *Reverence* and *Affection* in the discharge of holy Duties, by sensible Actions, and remarkable Circumstances. But he pursues his Errour; and Instances, *That the Surplice is not for gravity, nor merely for decent distinction; but a religious mystical habit, the Character or Badge of a sacred Office, or Service; conformable to the linnen Ephod under the Law.* Ibid.

Significant Ceremonies not sacred.

The grand Exception against the Surplice is matter of Scandal, and that amounts to nothing where People will be peevish, and carp at every thing. Allow it what Original he pleases: If it be neither Unlawfull in it Self: nor wickedly applied; and by Authority thought fit to be Imposed; why should it not be used?

Ecclesiast. Polity, Lib. 5. Sect. 29.

Ec. Polity. lib. 4. Sect. 12.

* The Euanomian Hereticks in dishonour of the blessed Trinity, brought in the laying on of water but once, to crosse the custom of the Church, which in Baptisme did it thrice.

What says the Incomparable Hooker, in this point? *To solemm actions of Royalty, and State, their suitable Ornaments are a Beauty; are they only in Religion a stain? And in another place. The names of our Monchs, and of our Days, we are not ignorant from whence they came, and with what dishonour unto God they are said to have been devised at the first. What could be spoken against any thing more effectual to stir hatred, than that which sometimes the Ancient Fathers in this case speak? Yet those very names are at this day in use throughout Christendom, without hurt or scandal to any. Clear and manifest it is, that things devised by Hereticks, yea, devised of a very Heretical Purpose, even against Religion, and at their first devising worthy to have been withstood, may in time grow meet to be kept; as that custom, the Inventers whereof were the * Euanomian Hereticks. So that Custom once established, and confirmed by use, being presently without harm, are not in regard of their corrupt original, to be held scandalous. But concerning those Ceremonies, which they reckon for most Popish, they are not able to avouch that any of them was otherwise instituted, than unto good; yea, so used at the first.*

The signing with the sign of the Cross (they conceive) is more evidently sacred than the former. As Baptism consecrates the Child, so doth the Cross; it is used as a sealing sign of our Obligation to Christ, as the words used in the application thereof do manifest; and the Book of Canons doth declare expressly, which saith That it is an honourable badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the service of him that dyed on the Cross, as by the words used in the Book of Common Prayer it may appear: And therefore it is in that respect Sacramental. Pag. 87.

'Tis well a nurtur'd Child, that gives his Mother the Lye: and it is little better, to charge this sense upon the Church of *England*; when by the very Letter of the Canon, an expresse care is taken to prevent all possibility of exception, by a clear explication of

of the Churches Judgment in that particular. The Juggle is so gross, I need but cite the Canon to confute it.

First, The Church of England since the abolishing of Popery, hath ever held and taught, and so doth hold and teach still, that the sign of the Cross used in Baptism, is no part of the substance of that Sacrament; for when the Minister dipping the Infant in Water, or laying Water upon the Face of it (as the manner also is) hath pronounced these words; I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the Infant is fully, and perfectly Baptized. So as the sign of the Cross being afterwards used, doth neither add any thing to the vertue or perfection of Baptism; nor being omitted, doth detract any thing from the effect and substance of it.

Secondly, it is apparent in the Communion Book, that the Infant baptized, is by vertue of Baptism, before it be signed with the sign of the Cross, received into the Congregation of Christs Flock, as a perfect Member thereof, and not by any power ascribed unto the sign of the Cross; so that for the very remembrance of the Cross, which is very precious to all them that rightly believe in Jesus Christ, and in the other respects mentioned. The Church of England hath retained still the sign of it in Baptism, following therein the Primitive and Apostolical Churches; and accounting it a lawful outward Ceremony, and honourable badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the service of him that died upon the Cross, as by the words used in the Book of Common Prayer it may appear. Canon 30.

If this will not suffice to prove that nothing Sacramental is intended by it; let it be noted, that in *Private Baptism* the Cross is totally omitted.

His next exception is at *Holy dayes*: I But shall pass my bounds too far. I'll borrow one *Maxime* of the judicious Hooker upon that Subject, which shall serve for all. *Those things which the Law of God leaveth arbitrary, and at Liberty, are all subject unto positive Laws of men: which Laws, for the Common benefit, abridge particular mens liberty in such things, as far as the rules of equity will suffer.*

Ecclef.
Polity, Lib 5.
Sect 71.

After the *Quality* of our Ceremonies, the holy man will have one sting at the *Number* of them.

If the English Ceremonies be warrantably used, what hinders the use of divers other Ceremonies used in the Roman Church? Is it said their multitude will become burthensom and inconvenient? But who can determine the convenient number? And however, an exchange of one Ceremony for another were not unlawfull. For what reason may not
some

some other Romish rites in Baptism be used as well as the Cross, seeing they are nothing less significant or inoffensive; nay, peradventure much more inoffensive, because the Papists by giving divine Worship to the Cross have abused it to grosse Idolatry. Pag. 88.

Beggars must be no chusers: Must we use all, or none? The English Church hath made Election of the English Ceremonies; *What*, and how *many*: being the proper Judge both in the point of Number, and Convenience. 'Tis not for us to Question the Authority, but to obey it. *What if the Cross hath been abused?* So hath the *Knee* been bent; the *Hands* and *Eyes* address'd to an Idol. Are we, because of this misapplication, prohibited to worship the true God, in the same manner, and posture? Now to the *Liturgy* again.

The Presbyterians are not satisfied in the present Liturgy, but desire it may be laid aside, or much Reformed. And what solid reason withstands the Equity of this Desire? Pag. 90.

This solid reason does withstand it. They beg like sturdy Cripples, for Christ's sake, with a Cudgel. And 'tis not safe for Authority to give ground to a Faction.

Whosoever observes impartially, shall find that Political Prudence was joyned with the Christian Piety in composing the English Service-Book. Pag. 91.

And the same *Prudence* is now joyn'd with the same *Piety*, both in the Right, and Interest of preserving it. His next grief is a heavy one.

Canonical subscription lately impos'd, is a yoke of Bondage, (Now mark him) to be considered by all those that have a true regard to such Liberty in Religion, as equity and necessity pleads for. Pag. 94. Either this passage is seditious, and to enflame the people against Authority, or I am no Englishman.

The Canon (says he, Pag. 95.) requires a subscribing to the thirty nine Articles; to the Common-Prayer Book; to the Book of ordering Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; that all these contain in them nothing contrary to the Word of God. Canon 36. This is unreasonable, unprofitable, and unnecessary. Nay, let us take in the third Article too.—To wit, That the nine and thirty Articles are agreeable to the word of God. And now the Form of subscription, viz. I do willingly, and ex aimo, subscribe to these three Articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.

This is the *Yoke of Bondage*, which our Reverend Libertine complains of. First, to the *unreasonableness* of this subscription.

Touching

Touching the *King's Supremacy*, asserted in the first Article, he is silent; and I suppose he would be thought consenting. As to the rest, what *Reason* is there that any man should be admitted into the *Ministry*, without subscribing to the Constitution of that Church, into which he seeks admittance?

If he cannot subscribe in *Conscience*, he cannot be admitted in *Prudence*: and if he refuses in point of Stomack, that man is not of a Gospel-temper. In fine, he that holds a fair opinion of the *Doctrine*, and *Discipline*, of the Church of *England*, may very *reasonable* set his hand to his opinion: and he that does not, may as *reasonably* be rejected, because of such disagreements. So much for *unreasonable*; Neither is it *unprofitable*: for such as have any spark either of Honour, or Shame, will in regard to such a Testimony, be tender of giving themselves the Lye, whatsoever they would do otherwise.

Canonical sub-
scription de-
fended.

His third Cavil is, that it is *unnecessary*; (so are his exceptions.) Let any man consider, when all these Bars and Limits are too little to restrain turbulent and sacrilegious spirits from dangerous and irreverent attempts: what Seas of *Schism* and *Heresy* would break it upon us, were but these Banks demolish'd. But he hath found out an expedient, how *Unity in Doctrine*, and *Uniformity in Practice*, may be as well attain'd and far more kindly, without this enforced subscription: (that is) *If no Minister be suffered to Preach, or Write any thing contrary to the established Doctrine, Worship or Discipline, nor ordinarily for the main to neglect the established Rule.* Pag. 97.

This last passage appears to me most spitefully pleasant, Not *ordinarily for the main*: that is Always sometimes, he would neglect the established Rule.

If the Laws already in force against *Revoltors*, had been duly executed, 'tis likely the *Interest of England*, in the matter of Religion had not been now the Question. But still this supposition does not imply an absolute sufficiency of that strickness to all intents and purposes of Order, and Agreement. 'Tis what we *think*, not what we *say*; the Harmony of *Souls*, more than of *Forms*, which God regards: without that sacred, and entire consent of Judgment, and Affections, the rest is but a flat and cold Formality.

Not

Not to Act contrary to prescribed Rules; (where we are bound up by a Penalty) is but a Negative, and Passive Obedience; a compliance rather with Convenience, than Duty, unless joyn'd with a prone, and full assent, both to the Truth, and Equity of those determinations. For this and many reasons more, *Canonical subscription* seems to me exceeding necessary. But for those People to decline it, (upon pretence forsooth of Conscience) that upon pain of Freedom, and Estate, nay, and of Hell it self, enforced the *Covenant*, is most unequal.

The late Kings Declaration concerning Scotland, pag. 423.

A Presbyterian Preacher, * *refused to Pray for Sir William Nesbitt, late Provost of Edenhurgh, when he was lying upon his Death-bed, only because he had not subscribed the Covenant.* Let me be Pardon-ed, if I understand not this incongruous Holiness.

As for the Decrees and Canons of the Church, what rightful Authority doth make them, as the Law of the Medes and Persians that altereth not? Pag. 101.

Surely he over-shoots himself. *What rightful Authority? The Kings: and by a less Authority they cannot be discharged.* By that Authority, that Licenses * the Excommunication of the Impugners of the Rites and Ceremonies established in the Church of England: — the Opposers also of the * Government, by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, &c. — By that Authority, to which this Gentleman hath forfeited the Head he wears. Well, but he tells us,

The Publick state of these Differences is such, that the Prelatist may, and ought to descend to the Presbyterians, in the proposed moderate way; but the Presbyterians cannot come up to the Prelatists in the height of their way, Pag. 97.

With the Kings leave, had been good Manners yet. By what Authority, does Presbytery pretend to unseat the Hierarchy? All the World knows, (as much as they know any thing of that Antiquity) that Bishops are of Apostolical Extraction: and we are not to Imagine, that They died intestate, and their Commission with them. But Bishops have descended already, and what was the event of it? Truly it was as moderate an Episcopacy as Heart could wish: But, as I remember, their Revenues were not employed to maintain a Practical Ministry. The Rule is, Si vis an velim, effice ut possim nolle. But see the moderation of the Man.

Some change (he says) in the outward Form, and Ceremonies, which are but a Garb, or Dress, is no Real change of the Worship. Pag. 103.

I thought

I thought we had differ'd upon point of *Conscience*, about *Ceremonies proper sacred*, Pag. 84. *and parts of Worship*. But now it seems 'tis but the *Garbe*, or *Dress* we stick at. The good man has forgotten himself; And yet we had best be wary, for 'tis but an *Untoward* hint he gives us. *Oftentimes* (says he) *moderate Re-formations do prevent Abolitions, and Extirpations*, Pag. 103.

They do so, often; and sometimes they cause them: that is; Be the State never so distemper'd, where Subjects turn Reformers, the Remedy is worse than the Disease. In fine, when I look back, I find the very same desires of Reformation originally pretended; which (after such descensions as never any Prince before the blessed Father of our Gracious Sovereign, made to his Subjects) proceeded yet to utter *extirpation, Root, and Branch*.

The present face of things looks so like Twenty years ago, I cannot chuse but fear the same Design from the same Method; the same Effects from the same Causes. *Is not that likely to be a blessed Reformation, where Faction dictates, and Tumults execute*: But our *Passive Moderator* is of another Temper sure; he only advises a Yielding, for fear of worse: especially considering,

That the Party called Presbyterian may be Protected, and Encouraged, and the Episcopal not Deserted nor Disobliged, Page 111. (Which is his Resolution upon the Second *Quare*.)

Presbyterian Improvements, are Commonly a little *Senister*; (or as a man may say, *over the left Shoulder*) They have away to themselves, of making a *Glorious King, and a Happy People*. But we shall not dispute the *Possibility* of doing many things which may be yet of dangerous Experiment. I do believe it possible for a man to *flye*; yet set him upon *Pauls*, and Lure him down, upon the *Tryal*, 'tis at least Six to Four he breaks his Neck. Truly in my Opinion this Proposal is all out as Impracticable. But 'tis all one to Me. What if the Two Church-Parties, can Agree, or what if they cannot. My business is to keep the Presbyterian from laying Violent hands upon the *Civil Power*, and to convince a Party so denominated, of *Sedition*, not of *Schism*. His Third Enquiry follows.

Q^a. III. *Whether the upholding of both Parties by a just and equal Accomodation, be not in it self more desirable, and more agreeable to the State of England, than the absolute exalting of one Party, and the total subversion of the other ?* Pag. 111. (And thus he Reasons.)

That state of Prelacy which cannot stand without the subversion of the Presbyterians, and that stands in opposition to regulated Episcopacy, will become a mystery of a meer carnal and worldly state, under a sacred title and venerable name of our Mother the Church. For in such opposition, of what will it be made up, but of Lordly Revenue, Dignity, Splendor, and Jurisdiction, with outward ease and pleasure ? What will its design be from age to age, but to uphold and advance its own pomp and potency ? Read the Ecclesiastical Histories, and you shall find the great business of the Hierarchy hath been to contest with Princes and Nobles, and all ranks and degrees, about their Immunities, Priviledges, Prebeminencies, to multiply Constitutions and Ceremonies for props to their own Greatness, but not to promote the Spiritual Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ in the hearts of People, according to the life and power of Christianity.

Let this serve for a taste of his Pedantique Boldness. Whether the Scandal, or the Danger of these Liberties is the Greater, may be One Question : and whether the Usurper of this Freedom is the better Subject, or Christian, may be another. If we respect the holy Order of Bishops, together with the Sacred Authority of Law, by which they are here establish'd, how scandalous and irreverend is this Inveective ? Or if the unsettled humour of the People ; how Dangerous ? if we reflect either upon Christian Unity, or Political Obedience ; how inconsistent is this manner of proceeding with what we owe to God, and the King ?

That State of Prelacy, which cannot stand without the subversion of the Presbyterians, &c. ——— 'Tis very well ; ——— And why the subversion of the Presbyterians ? How those that never were Up, should be thrown Down, I cannot imagine. By what Law, or by what Equity, do these People pretend to any Interest of Establishment in England ? Those of the Presbyterian Judgment, that out of a real tenderness cannot comply in all particulars, will beyond doubt receive from His Majesty such Favour, and Indulgence, as may abundantly suffice to their relief. But that pre-

terence

tence doth not one jot entitle them to challenge a further Influence upon the Government. These wayward appetites and Cravings, are but the sickly Longings of a peevish Woman. A kind of voluntary and priviledg'd Conscience they have, which if it happens to take a fancy even to the *Crown*; *Monarchy* it self, must rather perish, than these poor Wretches lose their *Longing*. Soberly, I would advise them by any means, to wave these troublesome and groundless pretences: It starts a scurvy Question, and makes the People ask, *how they came by the right they challenge?*

*A voluntary
Conscience.*

For the rest, Episcopacy is like to be well ordered, when the Presbyterians have the Regulation of it. There have been great contests (no question) mov'd by the *Hierarchy*; but I suppose this Gentleman will not instance in many, since the Reformation, derogatory to the Jurisdiction Royal. Whereas the whole Course of the Presbyterian Discipline hath been Tumultuous; and their avowed Principles are more destructive to Royalty, than even the Rankest of the Jesuites themselves.

Having at length Talk'd his Fill against the Pomp of *Prelacy*; and Charged the arrogance of *Presbyters* upon the *Bishops*: Thus he Concludes,

In very deed, the State here described, will never stand safely among a People that are Free, Serious, Searching, and discerning in matter of Religion, Pag. 114. Which to the Many, sounds thus much. This is the Pride, and Tyranny of Bishops; and none but a Slavish and Besotted People will endure it. He that makes other of it, forces it. Having by the Spirit of Natural Divination foretold the effects which He Himself intends to Cause; he gives this Hint to the Vulgar, That a Hierarchy of this Nature hath a strong bias toward Popery. Ibid. No doubt, and so had Monarchy. Was not this Imputation by the same Party, cast upon the late King, and with the same measure of Confidence, and Bitterness? When yet we know that those that charged him with it, did not believe themselves; it was so rank, and evident a Calumny. Not to insist upon the Dying Testimony of that Incomparable Prince, (which was but suitable to the Pious Practice and Profession of of his whole Life) That early Protestation of His Majesty, before His receiving of the Holy Eucharist at Christ-Church in Oxon, 1643, will be more pertinent to my purpose.

Bibliotheca
Regia, p. 58.

His Majesty being to receive the Sacrament from the hands of the Lord Arch-Bishop of Armagh, used these publick Expressions immediately before His receiving the Blessed Elements: He rose up from His Knees, and beckning to the Arch-Bishop for a short forpearance, made this Protestation.

MY LORD,

His Majesties
Protestation.

I Espy here are many resolved Protestants, who may declare to the World the Resolution I now do make. I have to the Utmost of my power prepared My Soul to become a worthy Receiver; and may I so receive Comfort by the Blessed Sacrament, as I do intend the Establishment of the True Reformed Protestant Religion, as it stood in its Beauty in the happy days of Queen Elizabeth, without any Connivence at Popery. I bless God, that in the midst of these publick Distractions, I have still Liberty to Communicate; and may this Sacrament be My Damnation, if My Heart do not joyn with My Lips in this Protestation.

This was not yet enough to allay the clamour, till with His Royal Blood he had Seal'd this Protestation. If the objecter can produce a fouler injury either to Religion, Duty, Truth, Honour, or Humanity, let it be done to save the credit of the Faction, unless they reckon the superlative perfection of their Wickedness, a point of Glory.

His next remark is not amiss. *Let it be well observ'd, that the designs of suppressing Puritans, and complying with Papists, had their beginning both at once, and proceeded in equal paces. Pag. 115.*

Let it be here as well observ'd that if by Puritans be meant those of the Separation, by Papists is intended such as kept their Stations: These Revolters esteeming as Anti-Christian, whatever stands in opposition to their heady purposes. We have this both from Story and Experience, that it hath been the constant practice of these unmannerly Apostates, to speak evil of Dignities; and being fall'n off themselves, it is but carnal prudence, by damning of the Authority to justify the Schism. No wonder then if the designs of suppressing Puritans, and complying with Papists, had (in his sense) the same beginning, and proceeded in equal paces.

To bring himself off, he shifts it thus, Pag. 116. *According to a vulgar sense, we take Popery in the height thereof, for the Heresies and Idolatries; and in the lower degree thereof, for the gross Errors and Superstitions of the Church of Rome; and 'tis against English Popery in the lower degree, that he plants his battery: arguing so formally against our going over to Rome, that any Stranger to the Story would swear, The Prelates and the Pope were more than half agreed already.*

Having at length with great good-will, advised the Church of England as to the Main, he concludes, that *All approaches and motions towards Rome are dangerous*, Pag. 120.

But are not all recesses from Truth, more dangerous? Because in every thing we cannot agree with them, must we in nothing? To me this appears rather Petulancy, than Pious Reason. We are to hold fast the Truth, wherever it lies: and to embrace what's good, and laudable in any Church, without adhering to the contrary. Did not St. Paul become all things to all men, that by all means he might gain some?

But if we walk upon the Brink (he tells us, Pag. 120.) we may soon fall into the Pit.) These wary men forget, that there's a Gulf on the one hand, as well as a Pit on the other: and that the narrow way is that which leads to Eternal Happiness.

But as to Reason of State (he says that) *enmity with Rome hath been reputed the Stability of England; concerning which the Duke of Rhoan hath delivered this Maxime; [That besides the Interest which the King of England hath common with all Princes, he hath yet one particular, which is, that he ought thoroughly to acquire the advancement of the Protestant Religion, even with as much zeal as the King of Spain appears Protector of the Catholick. ibid.]*

Allow this Maxime good in State, he hath but found a Rod to whip himself. The King of England ought to advance the Protestant Religion. Content. What now if these Disciplinarians prove no Protestants? But rather a Schismatical,

and dividing Party, driving an Interest of their own, under that specious name; and with great shew of Holiness, opposing not only the Practices and Rules of the Reformed Churches, but even the Fundamentals of Christianity it self? By whom will they be tried? or on what Judgment, and Authority will they rest? They Quarrel with the Order of Bishops; the Common-Prayer; the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; the Law of the Land; with Customs,

*English and
Scotch Presby-
terians no
Protestants.*

and.

and *Antiquity*: In short, with every thing but the *Geneva-Discipline*. They do by *That* too, as our Gallants do by *French Fashions*. The Court of *France* being the Standard of quaint *Mode* and *Dress*, to the one; as is *Geneva*, of *Church-Order* to the other. What is *there* used, though in it self extravagant enough, our humour is to-over do; and if the *French* wear but wide *Breeches*, we forthwith must wear *Petticoats*. Consult the Learned, and most Eminent Assertors of their *Discipline*; ask the grand Architect Himself, or indeed, any of His *Seētatours*, (of fair and honorable credit) concerning the Subject of our present Controversie. And,

I. *Whether it be a Protestant Opinion, that the Hierarchy is Antichristian?*

II. *Whether such Laws of Humane Institution, as neither contradict the General Laws of Nature, nor any Positive Law in Scripture, be binding or no?*

III. *In case of Male-Administration, either in Church, or State: Whither the People may take upon them to Reform?*

But this they are not so stiff in, as to maintain it, but by blind inferences not worth regard.

This is the state of our dispute; and if in these particulars our *Anti-Prelatists* oppose the current of Reformed Divines: to advance their Interest, is to undermine the common Interest of the *King, Nation* and the *Protestant Cause*. Needs must it move many *Revolts*, and keep off many *Proselytes*, to see such Principles declared of the Essence of *Christian Religion*, as a good honest *Pagan* would be ashamed of. Nor less repugnant are they to Rules of *Society*, than of *Conscience*; No *Tyranny* so cruel, and *Imperious*; no *Slavery* so reproachful. Set up their *Discipline*, and we're at *School* again. Methinks I see a *Presbyter* with his *Rod* over every *Parish*; and the whole Nation turning up their Tails to a pack of *Pedants*. Yet hateful as it is, even that it self, establish'd by Authority, might challenge our Obedience. I have digress'd too far; yet in convenient place I must say something further upon this Subject.

If our new fangled *Politician* had consider'd, that the *King's* Interest leads him to support, that which the *Presbyterians* strive to overthrow, (the *Protestant Religion*) I am persuaded he would have spared the Duke of *Rohan* in this particular. The *Maxime* even as it lies before us, affording matter of dangerous deduction

deduction to his disadvantage: but taken in Coherence, nothing can be more sharp and positive against him.

That great and wise Captain the Duke of Rhoan discoursing upon what reasons of State, Queen Elizabeth acted toward Spain, France, and the United Provinces; tells us particularly, how much she favoured the Protestants in France, and Germany. [*Par toutes ces maximes, (dit il) cette sage Princeesse a bien fait comprendre, à ses successeurs, que outre l' interest que l' Angle terre a commun avec tous les Princes, &c. —*

L' Interest des
Princes Dis-
cours. 7.

' By all these Maximes (*says he*) this wise Prince's hath given her Successors to understand, that besides the Interest which England hath common with other Princes; yet one particular it hath, which is to advance the Protestant Religion with the same Zeal, the King of Spain does the Catholick.

Be it here noted, that when the Queen was most concern'd, and busie to promote the Protestant Cause, even at that very time was She as much employ'd to crush the Presbyterian Faction, viz. Cartwright, Coppinger, Arthington, Hacker, and their Confederates. The First of these was Imprison'd, and fined for Seditious, and Schismatical practices against the Church and State. The Second starved himself in a Goal; The Third repented, and publicly recanted; The Fourth was put to Death for horrid Blasphemies. (These People talk'd of a practical Ministry too.) The Men are gone, but their Positions are still in being, and only attend a blessed opportunity to be put in Execution. This may appear from diverse late discourses, which are effectually no other than Cartwright's Principles, and Model, couch'd in waryer terms, and other Authority than these, or such as these, I think the very Authors of them will scarce pretend to.

Puritan Pro-
testants.

One Observation more. Our Paraphrase renders the advancement of the Protestant Religion, — Enmity with Rome, to the great scandal of the Reform'd Profession. We have no Enmity but with Error, which in a rigid Puritan, to us, is the same thing as in a Papist.

But Popery (he tells us,) hath been ever infamous for Excommunicating, Murthering, and Deposing Princes.

I am no Advocate for the Roman Cause, but upon this account, I think betwixt the Jesuite, and the Puritan, it may be a drawn Battle. And yet he follows, with an assurance that the Protestant Religion aims at nothing, but that the Kings Prerogative, and Po-

pular

ular Liberty, may be ever Ballanced. Pag. 121. (That is, the Puritans the Presbyterian Religion, as he explains himself a little lower.)

I cannot call to mind one single passage in this whole Discourse, concerning the *King's Power*, or the *Peoples Liberty*; which is not either worded Doubtfully, or with some popular Limitation upon the Royal Authority. What does he mean by *even Ballanced? Cheek by Jowl?* Or by what warrant from the Word of God, does a Presbyters Religion intermeddle with Popular Liberty? Unless the holy Man intends to bring *Homage to Kings*, within the compass of *Ceremonies of Humane, and Mystical Institution*. Yet once again.

The Presbyterians Principle (he says) *is for subjection to Princes, though they were Hereticks, or Infidels; and if they differ herein from the Prelatical Protestants, (I was afraid we had been all Papists) it is only that they plead for Liberty, settled by known Laws, and Fundamental Constitutions.* Pag. 122.

Still *ad Populum?* These are the Incantations which have bewitch'd this Nation. This Charm of *Qualify'd Disloyalty, and Conditional Obedience*. Behold the very Soul of the Faction in in these five lines; a fair profession first to His Majesty, and with the same breath a Seditious hint to the People. What is that Liberty he talks of, but a more colourable title to a Tumult? That Legal Freedom, to which both by the Royal Bounty, and our own Birth-right we stand entituled, we ought not to contest for our Sovereign, and (God be prais'd) we need not. Now for another fit of kindness.

His Majesty our Native King, may govern as he pleases, without fear of Hazzards, by continuing to shew himself a common Father. Pag. 123.

What's this Clause a kin to the third Article of the Covenant? *To preserve and defend the King's Majesties Person, and Authority, in the preservation and defence of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdoms, (as who should say, if he does otherwise, let him look to himself.)*

The excessive dominion of the Hierarchy, with the rigorous imposition of humane Ceremonies, was accounted much of the malady of former times, which ended in those deadly Convulsions of Church and State. Ibid.

Since this Pragmatical Levite will provoke a Controversie, I am content to entertain it.

If the Bishops excesses were the Cause of the War, how came the Kings ruine to be the event of it? But 'tis no new thing for a Presbyterian to faddle the wrong Horse. Just in this manner did the Covenanters treat His late Majesty: and *by those very Troops that cry'd down Bishops was the King murder'd.* Ridiculous Brutes, to boggle at a Surplice, aad yet run head-long into a Rebellion.

The grand source of our Miseries was the *Covenant*, by which as by a Spell (in the Name of the Blessed Trinity) the People were insensibly bewitched into an aptness to work any Wickedness which the Interpreters of that Oracle should say was the Intendment of it.

The first notorious Rupture was in *Scotland*, in 1637. usher'd in by a COVENANT, which without Question was formally agreed upon by the confederate Faction of both Kingdoms, as the most proper, and least hazzardous way of tasting the Kings Patience, and the Peoples humours. That their Design was laid, and carried on by Counsels, and Intelligence, as aforesaid, may be collected from the Consequent, and Brotherly Agreements: and truly the Retrospect of the Act of *Indemnity* seems to hint no less, for it commences from the first Scottish Broyls, tho four or five years before the War broke out in *England*; what was begun by *Covenant*, was so prosecuted.

By vertue of the Covenant, the Kirk-party supply'd themselves with Men and Monies: Armies were brought into the Field; and beyond doubt, many that truly loved the King, not knowing what they did, engaged against him. To keep up this Delusion, the Press and Pulpit did their parts, and to deal freely, after this advance, I should as much have wondred if they had stop'd short of his Death, as I find Others wondering how they durst accomplish it. Death with a *Bullet* or an *Axe*, is the same *Mischief* to him that suffers it: and the same *Crime*; willfully done, in those that *Act* it. No man can Rationally *allow* One, and *condemn* the *Order*: For, if the Violence be Lawful; why not as well as in the Field, upon a Scaffold?

In this particular, the Doctor is beside his Cushion. He makes me think of the Marquess of *Newcastle*, upon a sawcy Clergyman. Why should I remember that he's a Priest, (says my Lord) if he forgets it himself? His next argument against *Prelacy* is a Modest, and (as I take it,) a queynt One.

Can the self same State, (says he) and Frame of Ecclesiasticks be now revived after so great and long continued alterations, by which the Anti-prelatical Party is exceedingly increased and strengthened? Pag. 124.

Cannot Prelacy be better Restored after a Discontinuance, than Presbytery erected, where it never had a Being. The very Laws are yet to make for the One, and still in force for the Other. But the great Obstacle is, *the Anti-prelatical party is exceedingly increased, and strengthened.* Truly I think, if His Majesty should lessen the Number of them, by two or three of the Promoters of that Doctrine, the President might do some good upon the rest. Can any thing be more seditious? These hints upon fair grounds, and given in *Private*, might very well become the gravity of a Church-man, or the Profession of a Loyal Subject. But to the *People*, these Calculations are Dictates of Sedition; and only meant to engage the Credulous, and heady Multitude in false Opinions both of the Tyranny of Prelates, and their own Power.

Thus far in *Observation* upon the first Part of *The Interest of England, in the matter of Religion, &c.* ——— *The whole structure whereof (in his own words) rests upon these Positions, as its adequate Foundation.*

1. *That whilst the two forenamed Parties remain divided, both the Protestant Religion, and the Kingdom of England is divided against it self.*
2. *That the Presbyterians cannot be rooted out, nor their Interest swallowed up, whilst the State of England remaineth Protestant.*
3. *That their subversion, 'if it be possible to be accomplished, will be very pernicious to the Protestant Religion, and the Kingdom of England.*
4. *That the Coalition of both Parties into one may be effected by an equal accommodation, without repugnancy to their conscientious Principles on either side, in so much that*
nothing

nothing justifiable by Religion or sound Reason can put a Bar to this desirable Union.

The *whole matter* (in Debate, he tells us) rests upon Three main Enquiries.

- I. *Qu. Whether in Justice or Reason of State the Presbyterian Party should be Rejected and Depressed, or Protected and Incouraged.* Pag. 17.
part 1.
- II. *Qu. Whether the Presbyterian Party may be Protected and Incouraged, and the Episcopal not Deserted nor Disobliged.*
- III. *Qu. Whether the Upholding of both Parties by a just and equal accommodation be not in it self more desirable and more agreeable to the State of England, than the absolute Exalting of the one Party, and the total Subversion of the other.*

I shall now offer some further Reasonings of my Own, upon this Subject; therein proposing such *Brevity* and *Clearness*, that both the *Lazy*, and the *Busy* may find time to read it, and the *Weakest* not want Capacity to understand it.

His *first Position* holds no further good, than as the *Presbyterians* are first *Protestants* in the matter of the *Difference*, and then *Considerable* in the ballance of the *Nation*. *Religion* led the *Quarrel*, so let it the *Dispute*. In using the Word *Protestant*, I follow *Custom*, for I had rather call it *Catholick*: but *Protestant* let it be.

I suppose by the *Protestant Religion*, we understand That of the *Reformed Churches*: to whose *Decision* we shall willingly submit the sum of our *Disagreements*: which may be stated under a *Reduction* to these Two *Questions*.

I. *Qu. Whether or no the Government of the Church by Archbishops and Bishops—be Antichristian, or Unlawful?*

II. *Whether such Laws of Humane and Significant Institution, as are orderly made, and neither contradict the General Law of Nature, nor any positive Law in Scripture,--- be Binding or not?*

First, Concerning the Prelacy: Luther himself distinguishes betwixt *Popish Tyrants*, and *True Bishops*: professing his Quarrel to them as *Popish*, not as *Bishops*.

Apol: Confess: per Pap. Pag: 131.

The Authors of the *Augustane Confession*, leave it upon Record, *That they would willingly preserve the Ecclesiastical and Canonical Polity, if the Bishops would cease to Tyrannize over their Churches.*

De reform: aduer: Eccles: pag: 95.

Bucer advises by all means the restoring of such Ecclesiastical Governments as the Canons prescribe, (*Episcopis & Metropolitanis*) to Bishops and Metropolitans. Melancthon to Luther,——— *You would not imagine (says he) how some people are nettled to see Church-polity restored: as if it were the Romish Sovereignty again. Ita de Regno suo, non de Evangelio, dimicant socii nostri.*

Calvin himself recommends the Hierarchy to the King of Poland: and treating concerning the Primitive Church, says, *That the Ancient Government by Archbishops and Bishops, and the Nicene Constitution of Patriarchs, was for Orders-sake, and Good Government. ad Disciplinæ conservationem pertinebat.*

The same person being called to account by Cardinal Sadoleto concerning the Geneva defection, and for subscribing the *Augustan Confession* renders this Answer. *Cursed be such as oppose that Hierarchy, which submits it self to Christ Jesus. Nullo non Anathemate dignos centeo, quotquot illi Hierarchiæ, qui se Domino Jesu submittit, subijci nolunt.*

Zanchy (the Compiler of the Gallican Confession) observes a Change of Name, rather than of Office throughout most of the German Churches. Bishops and Archbishops being only disguised under the Notion of Superintendents, and General-Superintendents: acknowledging, that by the consent of Histories, Councils, and the
ancient

ancient Fathers those Orders have been generally Allowed of by all Christian Societies.

Beza, (the rigid Successour of *Calvin*,) being check'd by the Archbishop of Canterbury, for intermeddling beyond his sphere, — *We do not charge* (says he) *all Archbishops & Bishops with Tyranny.*

— *The Church of England hath afforded many Learned men, and many Glorious Martyrs of that Function. If that Authority be there still in Being may a perpetual Blessing go along with it. Fruatur sane ista singulari Dei beneficentia, quæ utinam illi sit perpetua.* This with all Ceremony was address'd, — *Totius Angliæ Primati: to the Primate of all England, and in the Name of the whole Church of Geneva.*

Saravia makes him speak yet plainer; who arguing for the Hierarchy out of the Apostles Canons, receives from *Beza* this Reply. *This is no more than what we wish might be restored to all Churches. Quid aliud hic statuitur, quam quod in omnibus locis Ecclesiis restitutum cupimus?*

Bez. contra Sarav. p. 116.

Zanchy comes up to the very Case of England; (nay and a little further too) not only affirming *Episcopacy to be agreeable to the Word of God.* But where it is in exercise, that it ought to continue, and where by violence it hath been abolish'd, that it ought to be restored. *Ubi vigent (Isti ordines scil.) non esse Abolendos, & ubicunque Iniquitas temporum eos abolevit, Restituendos.*

With what Face now shall the Enemies of Bishops call themselves Protestants, in this particular at least, wherein they evidently cross the whole stream of Protestant Divines? Now to the Second Query.

Whether such Laws of Humane, and Significant Institution, as are orderly made, and neither contradict the General Laws of Nature, nor any Positive Law in Scripture, be binding or not?

Hear *Calvin* first. *Quamvis quod obtruditur scandalum afferat, quia tamen verbo Dei per se non repugnat concedi potest. Scandals Taken, without Repugnancy to the Word of God, are not sufficient to invalidate the the Obligation of a Ceremony imposed by the Church.* *Beza* himself, nay, Mr. Cartwright, the Captain of our Blessed Legions, will allow, rather than quit a Benefice, to wear a Surplice.

Calvin Epist. Pag. 341.

Bucer

* *The HOLY CHEAT.*

*Scripta Angli-
cana*, 455.

Bucer thanks God with all his Soul to see the English Ceremonies so pure, and conform to the Word of God; or at least (rightly understood) not contrary to it.

H.L.S. His Af-
finity of Sacred
Liturgies, p.27

Not to hunt further for particular Authorities, I shall be bold with my own Brother, and make use of some general Collections which He hath gathered ready to my hand.

Nothing assuredly can be more demonstrative of the Protestant Tenents, than the Confession of their several Churches.

Cap. 27.

Cap. 15.

Act. 32.

Act. 32.

Act. 15.

Act. 20.

Cap. 14.

That of Helvetia first, [Churches have always used their Liberty in Rites, as being things indifferent, which we also do at this day.] That of Bohemia, [Humane Traditions and Ceremonies brought in by; good Custom, are with an uniform Consent to be retained in the Ecclesiastical Assemblies of Christian People at the Common Service of God.] the Gallican; [Every place may have their peculiar Constitutions, as it shall seem convenient for them.] The Belgick; [We receive those Laws as are fit, either to cherish or maintain Concord, or to keep us in the Obedience of God.] That of Ausburg; [Ecclesiastical Rites which are ordained by mans Authority, and tend to Quierness and good Order in the Church, are to be observed.] That of Saxony; [For Order sake, there must be some decent and seemly Ceremonies.] That of Sweveland; [Such Traditions of men as agree with the Scriptures, and were ordained for good Manners, and the Profit of Men, are worthily to be accounted rather of God than of Man.] These were the Tenents they publickly owned, nor did they act different from what they taught, ordaining Churches, Pulpits, Prayers before and after Sermon, administering the Sacraments in Churches, delivering the Communion in the Forenoons, to Women, Baptizing Infants, and several other things. not one whereof were directly commanded by either Christ, or his Apostles.

From hence it is manifest, we may divide from Presbyterians, and yet the Protestant Religion not be divided against it self. A Schism there is, but whether in the Church, or in the Faction, is only a Dispute for those that plead the Authority of Tumults. As their Opinions are not one jot Protestant, where they divide from
Bishops;

Bishops; so neither are their *Morals* any more warrantable, wherein they act as *Men*. Which shall we credit, *Words* or *Deeds*? Will they not *Bite*, where they pretend to *Kiss*? A famous *Martyr* of that Party, (*Hacket*) served a Fellow so. Some difference there had been, and they were to be made friends, *Hacket* pretends a Reconcilement; takes the man in his Arms, bites off his Nose, and swallows it. This is that *Hacket* that was joyned with *Coppinger*, and *Arbington*, in a Plot to murder the Lords in the *Star-Chamber*, because they had committed *Cartwright* (the great *Rabbi* of the Party) whose Crime was only the erecting of the *Presbytery* without, and against the *Queens* Authority. Thus we see, *That in Queen Elizabeth's days too, the Protestant Religion was divided against it self*. Briefly, that it is not *Religion* which moves these People, is most apparent, from their unquiet and distempered Actings; proceed we now to enquire what it is, or in plain terms, to unmask the Holy Cheat, and shew it barefac'd to the People.

Of all Impressions, those of Religion are the deepest; and of all Errors, the most to be lamented, and indulged, are those of tender and mis-guided Consciences. The Clearness of this Principle considered, it is no wonder that the foulest Designs, put on the greatest shews of Holiness, as the only way to gain and rule Affections, without which no great Matters can be accomplish'd. This is a Truth well known to the *Presbyterians*, and of experiment as ancient as their Discipline.

We do not undertake to read their *Hearts*, but their *Writings* we may venture upon; enquire a little into their *Practices*, and by comparing both, give some tolerable guess at their *Intentions*. The readiest way is to look back, and match them; for the best prospect of the Future is behind.

Some Grumbings toward the Consistorian Discipline, there were in the Days of *Edward* the Sixth: But the first notorious Separation, was that of *Frankford* (in the Reign of *Queen Mary*) when *Gilby*, *Goodman*, and *Whittingham*, with their Companions, flew off, and went to *Geneva*; from whence they returned into *England*, soon after *Queen Elizabeth* came to the Crown. These led the Dance in *England*; *Knox* in *Scotland*, and at this day our *Presbyterians* do but write after their Copy; professing the same Principles, pretending the same Scruples, and beyond

yond doubt, proposing the same *End*; which was to get the same Dominion here, which *Calvin* and *Beza* exercised at *Geneva*: to whom they still repair'd for Counſel, as they needed.

Cartwright and *Travers* came in the Breech of thoſe, but not without conſulting *Beza* firſt, to learn the Knack of the *Geneva*-Model. Theſe were the men, that firſt brought into *England* that horrible Poſition, that the *Geneva*-Discipline was as eſſential a Note of the Church, as either the true *Preaching of the Word*, or the due *Adminiſtration of the Sacraments*. This is the Principle which ſupports the *Presbyterian* Intereſt.

For the firſt thirteen years of the *Queens* Reign, they contented themſelves to throw about their Libels againſt Ceremonies, and divide into *Conventicles*.

In the 14th. of Her Maſteſty, they addreſſed two *Admonitions* to the *Parliament*; the former in the quality of a *Remonſtrance* with a Platform; the other, bolder, and more peremptory. This *Parliament* was no ſooner Diſſolved, but they fell preſently to work upon their *Discipline*; the Progreſs whereof, is with great exactneſs ſet down in the *Third Book of Bancroft's Dangerous Poſitions*.

Dangerous
Poſitions.
Page 43.

In 1572. A *Presbytery* was Erected at *Wadſworth* in *Surrey*, at which time they had alſo their *Conventicles* in *London*, where little was debated, but againſt *Subscription*, the *Attire*, and *Book of Common-Prayer*.

Page 44.

In 82. A Meeting was appointed of 60 *Ministers*, out of *Effex*, *Cambridgeſhire*, and *Norfolk*, at *Cockfield*; to conſer about the *Common-Prayer*, — what might be tolerated.

Page 45.

In 83. The *Form of Discipline* was compiled, and *Decrees* made touching the *Practice* of it, which ſoon after were put in execution.

Page 75.

In 87. The *Discipline* was received, and put in practice in *Northamptonſhire*.

Page 86.

In 88. A *Classical Aſſembly* at *Coventry*.

Page 89.

In 89. A *General Meeting* in *Cambridge*, and another at *Ipswich*.

Page 91.

In 1590. Upon the *Detection of the Premises*, they reſuſed to answer upon *Oath*.

Being thus Associated, they appropriate to their Meetings the Name of the Church, and use the stile. The Offices of Lord Archbishops, and Bishops, &c. (says Martin Junior) are condemned by the Doctrine of the Church of England. Pag. 120.

By these degrees the Schismatics advanced to a dangerous height, and Boldness; and of this Temper, and Extraction are our Presbyterians. Pag. 125.

After the aforementioned discovery, a stricter eye and hand was kept upon them; divers of the Ring-leaders were Imprisoned, and the Covy broken.

Upon the coming in of King James, they began to stir again, but he knew them too well, either to Trust, or Suffer them.

How they behaved themselves towards the late King, is to the eternal Infamy, not only of the Faction, but of the Nation, too notorious: what they design toward the present Government, That's the Question: And now I come to enquire.——

Whether in Justice or Reason of State the Presbyterian Party should be Rejected and Depressed, or Protected and Encouraged.

Before I fall upon the Question, once again I explain myself. By PRESBYTERIAN, I intend a Faction, that under Colour of settling a Reform'd DISCIPLINE, seeks to dissolve the frame of an established Government. And first I am to prove that Party so distinguish'd, such a Faction, which both from their own Practices, Positions, and from Common Observation, and Authority, I think I shall make good; and that their last aim is to exercise that Tyranny themselves, which they pretend to punish.

We'll first examine how they treat the Civil Power.

If Princes be Tyrants against God and his Truth, their Subjects are freed from their Oaths of Obedience.

Kings, Princes, and Governors have their Authority of the People, and upon Occasion, the People may take it away again.

*Presbyters
Doctrins concerning Kings.*

Knox to Engl. and Scotl. fol. 78.

Gilly Obedience. pag. 25.

Register. p. 48.

Ministers ought not to obey the Prince when he prescribes Ceremonies, and a Fashion of Apparel.

Goodman. pag. 144.

Evil Princes ought by the Law of God to be deposed.

Spotswood History of the Church of Scotland. pag. 330.

Andrew Melvil being cited to answer for Treason delivered in a Sermon, declined the judgment of the King, affirming, That what was spoken in Pulpit, ought first to be Tryed and Judged by the Presbytery; and that neither the King nor Council might in *prima instantia*, meddle therewith, although the Speeches were Treasonable.

Scots Plea, pag. 262.

Strike the Basilick vein; nothing but this will cure the Pleurisie of our State.

King's Declaration concerning Scotland, p. 404. Ibid. pag. 409.

Let us never give over, till we have the King in our Power, and then he shall see how good Subjects we are. (Delivered in a Sermon.)

It is Lawful for Subjects to make a Covenant, and Combination without the King.

But to come nearer Home, to shew that the whole Gang is of the same Leaven. Worse than all this was daily Printed against the late King, even by those Persons that were in pay to the Presbyterian Faction: and yet at last, those outrages are justified against the Father, by such as would be thought Loyal to the Son.

Bancroft, pag. 169.

If Parliaments think to escape better they are deceived. If the Brethren cannot obtain their will by sure, nor dispute, the Multitude, and People must do the Feat.

Kings Declaration, fol. 404.

One Preached, That though there were never so many Acts of Parliament against the Covenant, yet it ought to be maintain'd against them all.

Ibid. 408.

The Parliament can make no Law at all concerning the Church, but only ratifie what the Church Decrees: and after it hath ratified it, yet if the Assembly of the Church shall prohibit it, and repeal that Decree of the Church, all the Subjects are discharged from yielding Obedience to that Act of Parliament.

Ibid. 411.

An Assembly may abrogate Acts of Parliament, if they any way reflect upon business of the Church.

Know.

Reformation of Religion belongs to the Commonalty.

Of the Parliament in the 24. year of the Queen (says the Supplication) if the desired Reformation be not granted; There shall not be a man of their feed that shall prosper, be a Parliament man, or bear rule in England any more.

Concerning *Laws established*; They Fall in Consequence with the Power that makes them.

Presbyterians Opinion of Bishops.

Let us see now with what modesty they treat the Church, and first the Bishops.

They are Ordinances of the Devil. — Proud, Popish, presumptuous, prophane, paltry, pestilent, pernicious Prelates, and Usurpers. — Robbers, Wolves, Simoniacks, Persecutors, Sowers of Sedition, Dragons, (and so to the end of the Chapter.) Baneroff, pag. 59.

Their Clergy an Antichristian, Swinish Rabble, — The Ministers are neither proved, elected, called, nor ordained according to Gods word. Ibid. pag. 58.

The Ceremonies — Carnal, Beggerly, Antichristian Poms.

Presbyterian Reformation.

Hitherto, the Faults of Governors, and Government, now their Proposals of Amendment, and Reformation; by what Rules, and by what Means we may be Governed Better. Thus then.

Let the whole Government of the Church be committed to the Ministers, Elders and Deacons. Admon. i.

Very good; and to whom the Government of the State?

Why to Them too. For the Church wherein any Magistrate, King or Emperor is a member, is divided into some that are to Govern: viz. Pastors, Doctors, and Elders: and into such as are to obey, viz. Magistrates of all sorts, and the People. Cartwright.

The Question is next, about the Extent of the Ecclesiastical Power, and in what manner That Assumption hooks in all Civil actions within their Cognifance?

In Ordine ad Spiritualia, Forsooth: by which rule nothing escapes them. Holy Discipline, pag. 260.

'Tis the desire of the Admonitor; that he and his Companions may be deliver'd by Act of Parliament, from the Authority of the Civil Magistrates: as Justices and others, and from their Inditings, and Finings. K 2 The

Ibid. 284.

Ibid.

The Elderſhip ſhall ſuffer no lewd cuſtoms to remain in their Pariſhes, either Games, or otherwiſe. And further; The Office of the Church Governors, is to decide Controverſies in Doctrine, and Manners, ſo far as pertaineth to Conſcience, and the Church Cenfures.

Ibid. 285.

Every Fault (ſays Cartwright) that tendeth either to the Hurt of a mans Neighbour, or to the hinderance of the Glory of God, is to be examin'd and dealt in by the Orders of the holy Church. Nay Knox goes further yet.

The bare Suſpition of Avarice, or of Pride, Superfluity, or Riotuſneſs in Chear or Rayment. — Even this Nicety, Falls within their Cenfure.

Now would I know what need of a Civil Magiſtrate, when even our private thoughts are ſubjected to the Scrutiny of a Presbytery?

But will ſome ſay, what ſignifies the intemperance of Particular tongues, as to the General of the Party. I am challenged by the Author of the *Interſt of England*, to produce their *Aſti- ons*: and *That's* my next Immediate Buſineſs.

The Presbyter has now the Chair, ſee how he manages his Greatneſs. None of that Tyranny ye found in Biſhops, I warrant ye: no *Groaning* now under the Yoke of *Anti-Chriſt*; the intolerable burthen of *Canonical Subscription*; the *Impoſition of Ceremonies* properly Sacred; the *Injunction of the Croſs in Baptiſm*; and that abominable Idol the *Common Prayer*.

Some words perhaps may ſlip unwarily, that might have been as well let alone; but alas good People, they mean no harm.

[Suppoſe that ſome of this way were guilty of ſome provoking forwardneſs, ſhould grave Patriots, and wiſe Counſellors thereupon deſtroy the weak Party, or rather heal it?] 'Tis indeed poſſible, that in the heat of a Reforming and Spiritual zeal, they may have let fall Speeches of holy Indignation againſt the Oppoſers of the LORDS ORDINANCE. But have they ſhewed their diſaffection either to * King or Parliament, by any thing deſcernable in their outward behaviour: have they controlled the Law of the Land, or the juſt Liberty of the People?

Interſt of
England. Part.
2. pag. 81.

By which term
they difference
their Claiſſical
Approbation,
from Episcopall
Ordination.

Interſt of
England. Part.
2. pag. 57.

If they have not done all this, there's a great ſaiſing both in our Stories, and our Memories. I know 'twill be objected, they *Petitioned*, and in a ſuppliant,

suppliant, and humble way, suitable to the duty of good Subjects. They did *Petition*; and in this manner.—— about the 27 of the *Queen*.)

May it please Your Majesty, &c.—— That it may be Enacted, &c.—— That the Book hereunto annexed, &c. Intituled, a Book of the form of Common Prayers, Administration of Sacraments, &c.—— And every thing therein contained, may be from henceforth authorized, put in ure, and practised throughout all Your Majesties Dominions.

The Reformers way of Petitioning.

Herein they press upon the Nation their own *Form*, which would not yet allow of any *Other*.

What they could not get established by Law, they settle yet by Practice, and privately agree upon a general endeavour to encrease the Party. But say they should be opposed?

Holy Discipline pag. 100.

Why then, have a fling at Evil Counsellours. If Her Majesty give ear to such Counsellours, She may have cause one day to lament. Then they Remonstrate, how miserably poor men have been handled; That Godly Ministers have been brought before the Bars of Justice; and that if this Persecution be not provided for, it is the Case of many a thousand in England: great troubles will come of it.

Bancrofts dangerous Position. pag. 53.

Ibid. pag. 56.

Ibid. pag. 57.

This numerous Party will not vary from it self, &c.—— The minds of men are fix'd in this Opinion, and are not like to be reduced to the practice of former times, Well said I. C. yet. Thousands (says another) do sigh for this Discipline; and ten thousands have sought it. We do protest unto Your Majesty, (say the Supplicators) that we will be no longer subject unto the Bishops unlawful, and usurped Authority, &c.—— And another. The truth will prevail, (speaking of the Discipline) in spite of your teeth, (meaning the Bishops) and all other Adversaries of it.

Interest of England, p. 29.

Ibid.

Bancroft, pag. 138.

Ibid. 11. 140.

In the late Kings Declaration, concerning the Tumults in Scotland: this way of Petitioning is very frequent; and this is that my Friend hints, in saying, that the Presbyterians have never ceased to sollicite, and supplicate, &c. But Words draw no Blood.

Interest of England, p. 53.

'Tis true, but such as these come very near it.

We *Phanſie* firſt, defects in Government; *Then* we *diſcourſe* them; after *That*, we *propoſe* a Reformation, which, if rejected, we proceed to *preſs* it: the *next* ſtep is a *Threat*, and *then* a *Blow*.

Where there are failings in Authority, 'tis not for private Perſons to take publick notice of them. Whoever does *that*, would *ſtrike* if he *durſt*. This is not meant of every ſlip, in common diſcourſe, either of *Heat*, or *Inadvertency*; (yet *that* is very ill too) but of *deliberate* Affronts; ſuch as proceed from a form'd *Habit* of Irreverence: and in that Caſe, I think 'twere no hard meaſure, if he that ſets his hand to the Kings diſhonour, ſhould loſe his Head for't.

Take it at worſt. Put caſe a Prince *Mis-governs*; yet we are ſure, that his *Superior* does not; and that reſpect we cannot pay to his *Failings*, we muſt allow to his *Commiſſion*. From *Words* proceed we now to *Actions*.

Presbyterian Practices toward their

SOVEREIGN.

THE *Presbyterian* is no ſooner in the Saddle, but (in the name of *Reformation*) how the man Gallops! *Kings*, *Parliaments*, *Laws*, and *Liberties*, *Oaths*, and *Covenants* are but as Feathers in his way.

I ſhall not clog this Section with many Inſtances. The Trayterous actings of the *Conventicle* at *Glasgow*, in 1638: the horrid outrages that uſher'd it, and the moſt deplorable conſequences that enſued upon it, contain enough to brand that Faction to eternity.

I ſhall the rather fix *there*, becauſe it brings the Caſe home; and firſt, in regard that the *Schiſmaticks* of both Nations acted by the ſame tye of Oath, and Intereſt. Next, as it is the Model, *they* have made the People Swear they would be damn'd by. Some of their many Inſolencies are theſe.

- I. *The Assembly is Independent either, from King or Parliament, in Matters Ecclesiastical.*
- II. *It is Lawful for Subjects to Covenant and Combine without the King, and to enter into a Bond of mutual defence against Him.*
- III. *An Assembly may abrogate Acts of Parliament, and discharge their fellow-Subjects from obedience to them, if they any way reflect upon the business of the Church.*
- IV. *They deny the Kings right of Calling or Dissolving Assemblies, and they continue to Sit and Act, notwithstanding His Majesties express Order for their Dissolution. (See the Kings Declaration.)*

Positions of the Conventicle at Glasgow An. 1638.

These Rebellious Proceedings are yet darkened by the transcending usurpations that followed them. But here I am bound; This only I may say;

Whoever has a mind to run the extremities of another War, and to see another King murther'd, let him give his Vote for Presbytery. And here let every man look behind him, and lay his finger on his Mouth.

As the Geneva Discipline is injurious to Kings, and stated Laws, so it is most ridiculously tyrannous to the People. *A great uproar arising in Edinburgh, about the making of a Robbin-hood, they of the Consistory, did excommunicate the whole Multitude.* 'Tis a strange tenderness possesses these Saints. *One of them being to Christen a Child, brake off in the middle of the Action, because he would not call it Richard.*

Presbyters tyrannous to the People. Bancroft, pag. 20. Ibid. pag. 105.

I suppose no man knew this kind of Cattel better than King James. *I was persecuted (says that learned Prince) by Puritans, not from my Birth only, but even since four Months before my Birth.* And to Prince Henry thus:

Presbyters persecutors of King James. King James his works. Pag. 305.

Take heed to such Puritans, very Pests in the Church and Common-weal, whom no deserts can oblige, neither Oaths or Promises bind, breathing nothing but Sedition, and Calumnies, aspiring without measure, railing without reason, and making their own imaginations (without any warrant of the Word) the Square of their Conscience. I protest before the great God,
and

Ibid. Pag. 160.

The HOLY CHEAT.

The Antiquity of Phana-ticks.

and since I am here as upon my Testament, it is no place for me to lye in, that ye shall never find with any Highlands, or Border Thieves, greater ingratitude, and more lies and vile perjuries, than with these Phanatick spirits. And I think every man may say as much that hath but known them.

We are at length by Gods great mercy, delivered from those Evangelical Impostors, and after all our wandrings brought once again into the Channel. We have our Prince, our Laws, our Freedoms, our Interest lies before us, and certainly we cannot be so mad, as now to dash a second time upon the same Rock: Yet they shall lose nothing for want of offering at it.

The Arguments of 1641. are set on foot again: The very same with Cartwrights, (that Consistorian Patriarch, as Bancroft terms him) nay, they are advanced already beyond pleading of their Cause, to pressing of it, by sawcy Importunities, and peremptory threatnings.

From what I have deliver'd, it cannot be deny'd but their Positions are Destructive to all Civil Government; And for their Practices, the Story is written in Blood.

This might suffice to end the Controversie concerning Reason of State, for certainly a Faction so Principled, cannot with safety to the Publick be Incorporated into any Politick Constitution. But I shall add some further Reasons, why by no means they are to be admitted.

Reasons
against Coali-
tion.

1. They're a Party never to be gain'd by Obligations: and this is manifest from their proceedings toward the late King, whose most unhappy Tenderneſs of Nature cost him his Life. And at this instant, that irreclaimable ingratitude is yet more clear towards His Majesty in being: whose unexampled Mercy, so much as lies in them, is converted to his Dishonor, and Destruction.

2ly. They ground their claim upon the Equity of their Cause, which if allow'd, by the same Reason they may serve this King as they did His Father.

3ly. Their Demands are Eridless, as well as Groundless, and it is not Prudential to grant any thing, to a Faction that will be satisfied with nothing. It is but Giving them a Power to Take the Rest.

4ly. They

4ly. They Expostulate, and what they get upon those Terms, they look upon rather as a Submission, than a Concession. The very manner of their Address has a spice of Mutiny in it, and they will hardly make an honest use of what they compass by dishonest means.

5ly. It is not advisable to encourage Tumultuary Combinations by Rewarding them.

6ly. The Dispute is not so much what their Consciences will Bear, as what their Importunities can Obtain: and to feel the Pulse of the Supreme Authority.

In fine, it is a contest betwixt the Law and a Faction, and a fair step toward a New Rebellion.

So much for Reason of State.

Now to the Justice of their pretences. The Quære is,

Whether in Justice or Reason of State the Presbyterian Party should be Rejected and Depressed, or Protected and Encouraged.

'Tis one thing what the King may do in point of Justice, and another thing what the Presbyterians may demand upon that score.

There is a Justice of Conscience, Honor, and of Prudence.

By the First: His Majesty is ty'd up in common with the meanest of His Subjects. That is, if the King find himself in Conscience bound to maintain Episcopacy in the state he found it, (Legally settled) he is not free to alter it.

Justice of Conscience.

In point of Honor: There's more Liberty, and whatever the King does in that Particular, is well done. But His Majesty not having as yet declar'd himself; what do we know, how far even upon That Point he may concern himself to reject the Presbyterians Demands: Partly out of Reverence to His Royal Father; in part, out of a Princely strictness to His own Dignity: and Partly out of a Generous tenderness toward his Ruin'd Party.

Justice of Honor.

First, As to what may seem relating to His Majesties Father.

That which these People urge, is what the late King chose rather to Dye, than Grant: which in His Εἰκὼν Βασιλική is intimated in these words.

Εἰκὼν Βασιλική. pag. 239.

In these two points, the preservation of established Religion, and Laws, I may (without vanity) turn the reproach of my sufferings, as to the Worlds censure, into the honor of a kind of Martyrdom, as to the Testimony of my own Conscience, the troublers of my Kingdoms, having nothing to object against me but this, that I prefer Religion, and Laws established, before these alterations they propounded.

Every word hath its weight, which fell from the Pen of that pious and judicious Prince. Nor can I overpass a caution of His learned Fathers; when I consider the sum of their proposals, which in effect is but a Condemnation of the late King, in the bold, and needless justification of *Themselves*. These are the words.

King James's
works. P. 157. *As for offences against your own Person and Authority, since the fault concerneth your self, I remit to your own choice to Punish or Pardon therein as your Heart serveth you, and according to the circumstances of the turn, and the quality of the Committer.*

Here would I also eike another Crime to be unpardonable, if I should not be thought partial: But the Fatherly love I bear you, will make me break the bounds of shame, in opening it unto you. It is then, the false and unreverent writing, or speaking of malicious men against your Parents and Predecessors. And a little further.

It is a thing monstrous to see a Man love the Child, and hate the Parents: as on the other part, the infaming and making odious of the Parents, is the ready way to bring the Son into contempt. And for conclusion of this point, I may also alledge my own experience: For besides the judgments of God, that with my eyes I have seen fall upon all them that were chief Traytors to my Parents, I may justly affirm, I never found yet a constant bidding by me in all my straits, by any that were of perfect age in my Parents days, but only by such as constantly bode by them; I mean, specially by them, that served the Queen My Mother; for so that I discharge my Conscience to You, my Son, in revealing to You the Truth, I care not what any Traytor, or Treason-allower, think of it.

Thus far His Majesty may find Himself concern'd in Honor to His Fathers Ashes, now to his dying Counsels.

Take heed of Abetting any Factions, or Applying to any publick Discriminations in Matters of Religion, contrary to what is in your Judgement, and the Church well settled.

The late King's Counsels.

I cannot yet learn that Lesson, nor I hope ever will you, that it is safe for a King to gratifie any Faction with the perturbation of the Laws, in which is wrapt up the publick Interest, and the Good of the Community.

ΕΙΧΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ. p. 236.
Ibid. p. 239.

What in effect do these People now desire, but that his Majesty would rather take their Counsel, than his Fathers? In the next Page, the King expresses a more than ordinary Earnestness; in these Words:

My Counsel and Charge to you is, that you seriously consider the former real or objected Miscarriages, which might occasion my Troubles, that you may avoid them. Ibid. 240.

Herein, his Majesty is tacitly conjured against them; it being a most notorious Certainty, That the late King lost both his Crown, and Life by overgranting. The now-pretended Cause of the Quarrel was not mention'd till after the War was begun. The Colour of raising an Army, being to fetch in Delinquents. After which (says his Majesty) among other lesser Innovations, this chiefly was urged: the Abolition of Episcopal, and the Establishment of Presbyterian Government.

ΕΙΧΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ, p. 62.

As to that Point of Imperial Honour, wherein his Majesty may possibly concern himself more immediately: It is a high excess of Goodness to make his Favours Common, where they are look'd upon so Cheap, (as here; Witness these daily new Transgressions since his most Gracious Pardon.) Some men (says the late King) have that height, as to interpret all fair Condescendings, as Arguments of Feebleness, and glory most in an unflexible Stiffness, when they see Others most supple, and inclinable to them.

Ibid. p. 169.

There remains yet a third Question under this Head of Honour; that is, How far his Majesties Generosity may extend it self in Favour, and Protection of those Persons that have serv'd him, through all extremities, till they have nothing left them beyond the hopes of Honourable Epi:aphs,

These People have *Consciences* too; a sense of *Duty* and *Religion*. They reverence the *Episcopal Order*, and *That*, which through the *Sides of Bishops*, was equally wounded, the *Order of Kings*. At last, those that *subverted* the *Former*, and *usurped* the *Latter*, demand (I think in reparation of their hazards) a *Presbyterian Government*. In that particular, our *Duty* teaches us not to direct our *Master*; only we take sober *Freedom* to answer our *Accusers*; and to profess to all the *World*, that those who fought *For King*, and *Bishops*, were in our *Opinion* as honest Men at least as they that fought *Against* them.

To his Majesties *Honourable Consideration*, I think in this point we may claim a *Right*. We have suffer'd *For* and *With* his *Royal Father*, and *Himself*; and the main *Justice* of the *Cause*, betwixt the *King*, and those that serv'd him, is the same thing: so that whoever strikes at *Us*, wounds our *Sovereign*.

Lastly, There is a *Justice of Prudence*, wherein a man may frame a thousand *Reasons* against the *Encouraging* of the *Presbyterians*: not speculative, and airy *Notions*, but close, and pinching *Reasons*; grounded upon weighty *Authority*, and a never-failing course of long *Experience*. (Yet not to dictate to his Majesty, to whose *Will* we submit our *Reasonings*.)

First, If their *Desires* were *Modest*, the *Manner* yet of promoting them, is too rude and positive; they *Preach* and *Prise* their *Grievances*, which is the way rather to stir a *Faction*, than allay a *Seruple*. Lord, (says Mr. Manton) give us the *Liberty* of the *Gospel*, before we go hence and be no more seen. As if *Episcopacy* were *Paganism*. 'Tis dangerous to grant more, to those that take too much. How do I reverence the *Divine Spirit* of his late Majesty!

The great *Miscarriage* I think is, that *Popular Clamors* and *Fury* had been allowed the *Reputation* of *Zeal*, and the publick *Sence*; so that the *Study* to please some *Parties* hath indeed injured all.

And again, Take such a *Course* as may either with *Calmness* and *Charity* quite remove the seeming *Differences* and *Offences*, by *Impartiality*; or so order *Affairs* in point of *Power*, that you shall not need to fear or flatter any *Faction*; for if ever you stand in need of them, or must stand to their *Courtesie*, you are undone: the *Serpent* will devour the *Dove*: you may never expect less of *Loyalty*, *Justice*, or *Humanity*, than from those who engage into *Religious Rebellion*; their *Interest* is always made *God's*, under the *Colours* of *Piety*; ambitious *Policies* march,

march, not only with the greatest Security, but Applause; as to the Populacy, you may hear from them Jacob's Voice, but you shall feel they have Esau's Hands, Ibid. p. 236.

To what I have said, I shall be bold to add a Justice of Proportion; and thereupon, two Questions.

1. Why should the Presbyterians, a Small, Irregular Party, pretend to give the Law to the Supreme Authority, the Established Constitution; and incomparably the greater Part of the Nation?

2. Why should those People, that with a more than Barbarous Rigour pres'd the Covenant, Ejecting, Sequestering, Imprisoning such as refused to take it, and without Mercy or Distinction; Those that in Publick barr'd Non-Covenanters the Holy Communion in express Terms with Adulterers, Slandcrers and Blasphemers, affirming in the Pulpit, That all the Non-Subscribers

The late Kings
Declaration
concerning
Scotland, pag.
Ibid.

to the Covenant, were Atheists? Why should (I say) those People that with so unlimited a Tyranny imposed upon the Nation a Rebellious League, to the Engagement of their Souls in Taking it, their Liberties and Fortunes in Refusing? I say yet once again, Why should those People now at last demand an Interest in that Government, which Root and Branch they laboured to extirpate? Or with what Face can they pretend to a Right to an Authority, where, but by Mercy, they have none to Life? (I speak of these late Libellers, and their Abettors.)

Let me be understood likewise by Presbyterians to intend those of the Scottish Race, to whom we are beholden for our Discipline. That Faction first advanced it self by Popular Tumult and Rebellion. Knox learned the Trick on't at Geneva, and brought it into Scotland: We had our Agents too, that did as much for us; These Fellows conferr'd Notes, set the Wheel going, and we were never perfectly quiet since.

Upon the whole Matter aforegoing (in the Gentleman's own words) we firmly build this Position;

That the Presbyterian Party ought not, either in Justice, or Reason of State, in any wise to be Encouraged, but rather Rejected; Neither ought they to be Protected in any Inconformity to the Law, but rather totally Depressed.

His Second Quære is soon dispatch'd, *viz.*

II. Qu. *Whether the Presbyterian Party may be Protected and Encouraged, and the Episcopal not Deserted nor Disoblig'd?*

First, many things are *Possible*, which are neither *Just* nor *Rational*; and therefore it matters not much to allow it the *One*, if I prove it not to be the *Other*. Imagine such a Contemperation of *Episcopal*, and *Presbyterian* Pretences, as might attonè their present Disagreements, yet where's the *King*? The Interest that's *Principal* in the *Concern*, is not so much as named in the *Question*. The Quarrel was about the *Militia*, not *Law-Sleeves*, and the *Royal* Party is to be taken in, as well as the *Episcopal*.

The Truth of it is, This Gentleman does not find it convenient at present to move an utter Extirpation of Bishops: but he proposes That, which granted, would most infallibly produce it: A *Consecration* forsooth, that for the better Credit of the Project, shall be called a *Regulated Episcopacy*; which in good honest English is next door to a *Tyrannical Presbytery*. In fine,

The Episcopal Authority is Deserted and Disobliged by the admittance of a Presbyterian Competition.

Yet pardon me, I have found a way to reconcile them; *Make but these squabbling Presbyterians Bishops, and the Work's done*; as *Presbyters*, they are *Encouraged*; and (I dare say) not *Disobliged*, as *Bishops*. The Plague of it is, there's neither *Justice* nor *Reason of State* for't, and so we are where we were again.

We shall make short work too with his Third Question; for in effect it spells just nothing.

III Qu. *Whether the upholding of both Parties by a just and equal accommodation, be not in it self more desirable and more agreeable to the State of England, than the absolute exalting of the one Party, and the total subversion of the other.*

I must needs take notice here of two *Mistakes*, the one in propriety of Language, *viz.* the Upholding of both Parties. One of those Parties is not *up*, and cannot be *upheld*. The other shifts the *Question*, and states the Difference betwixt the EXALTATION of the one, and the SUBVERSION of the other, when all that we desire, is but to keep both where they were, without *advancing* or *depressing* either.

If they have any Title to the Interest they challenge, the same had *Cromwel* to the *Crown*. This Question must be better stated before we think it worth an Answer.

One Reflexion now upon the whole.

Here's *Exaltation*; and *Subversion*: but not a Syllable of *Toleration*, and what's the reason of all this? They are afraid that would be granted, and how should they do then to pick a Quarrel? Their way is never to be satsfy'd in *Conscience*, with what the King can give in *Honour* and *Reason*; (His Sacred Majesties Observation) *A grand Maxime with them was always to ask something, which in Reason and Honour must be denied, that they might have some Colour to refuse all that was in other things granted; setting Peace at as high a rate as the worst Effects of War.* I have cited this already, but every Line drawn by that hand deserves to be repeated.

FIN. BAC.
p. 170.

To this, there is another End, that's common to the Gang, which is, to draw an *Odium* upon one Party, and a *Compassion* toward the other. And other End than this do I see none at all, in his *Absolute Exalting*, and *Total Subversion*. We cover no Change, but desire the contrary. How little soever it may appear to our purpose, 'tis very much to *theirs*, to have the People understand by *Absolute Exalting*, the dangerous, and intolerable *Pride of Bishops*; and by their *Total Subversion*, on the other side, how sadly the World goes with the *Professors of the Gospel*.

These trivial Appearances have more weight than commonly the World imagines: 'Tis not so much (as *Hocker* says) how small the Spark is that flyeth up, as how apt things about it are to take fire. Their Business is to stir the Affections of the Common People, which must be done by Means and Ways, to wise men, in themselves, ridiculous, but in their Applications, of most desperate Effects.

I speak

I speak in earnest, that very Tone they use in Preaching; that *Fellow-feeling-Tone* (as they would have it understood) is, I believe, of great use to their Business. I have observed the *Groans* that follow'd the *Abi-mee's*; and beyond doubt those sniveling Affectations are not without their Benefit. That 'tis a forc'd and acted Passion, is evident in this; they almost all of them use the same *Emphasis*.

I would not for my Hand let fall a Syllable that should cast a Scandal upon that Holy Ordinance: and with my Soul I reverence the Grave and Pious Clergy. We cannot attribute enough to God, assume too little to our selves: We cannot be too much afflicted for our Sins, nor too sensible of our own unworthiness: yet I suppose a fit Christian Sorrow may be contained within such Terms as to reach *Heaven*, without disturbing the *Congregation*. To come to a Church-door, and hear an Out-cry, as if a man were cutting for the Stone; and what's all this, but an afflicted Pastor mourning for those heavy Judgments that hang over the Land because of *Common Prayer*; and then the Sisters Groan so ruthfully, you'd swear five hundred Women were in Labour. Away with these Ostentations of Holiness,——but first away with the *Discourse* of them.

I must confess the Gentleman hath offered fair; and more I doubt than he can undertake for, were it accepted. What if Six *Presbyterians* of Seven, renounce his *Moderation*, and say, he treated without Commission; where's his *Pacifick Coalition* then? 'Tis for a Parity they struggle; which when they have got, they shall as much contest among themselves to crush again, as ever they did to introduce. Just thus was the King treated; He was to Rule in *Consecration* too, by the *Advice* of his *Presbyters*. And what came on't? The *Factions* interfer'd, the Change went round the Circle; and at long length, in the place of a most *Gracious Prince*, up-starts a most *Tyrannical Protector*.

And yet I verily think, a Way may be found out to work upon these People: Let the King settle their strict Form of Discipline, fill the *Presbyteries* with *Episcopal Divines*, and Elders of his own Party, I verily believe these very men would be as hot for Bishops. I cannot comprehend the Temper of that *Sacrilegious Tenderness* that makes men *Digest* Bishops *Lands*, and yet forsooth they cannot *Swallow* their *Sleeves*.

Only this Word. Some of the Authors I have quoted for *Episcopacy* (to deal sincerely) may be as well produced *against* it:

For

For That, let them look to't, I am Innocent, and my Cause clearer for it: They found it for their Interest to engage their Disciples in many Opinions, which for their Honour they would not undertake to defend against their Equals.

I Should end here, were I not drawn beyond my purpose, by a *Second Part*, from the same Hand; which should not yet divert me from my first Intention, could I but save my self, in letting it absolutely alone. By the Formalities of *Title and Connexion*, it seems related to the Former part, further than by some passages in the Treatise it appears to be: whereof some few I am concerned to Examine, and I shall shorten even that little I intended, as much as possible. He Calls it

A Deliberative Discourse,

PROVING

That it is not agreeable to sound Reason to prefer the Contracted and Dividing Interest of one Party, before the general Interest of Protestantism, and of the whole Kingdom of England, in which the Episcopal and Presbyterian Parties may be happily United.

We are agreed in *all* but in the *Main*; and as to That, I have already shewed, that in the Subject of our Difference, the *Presbyterian Party*, (that is, the *Kirk Party*) is divided from the *Protestant*: So that unless it can be made out, by the Judgment of the *Reformed Churches*, that *Prelacy* is *Anti-christian*, and that *Instituted Ceremonies* are *Unlawful*; the Author of this *Deliberation* overthrows himself by his own Argument, of preferring the *General Interest of Protestantism, before the Contracted, and Dividing Interest of one Party*. We should not take in *Discipline* within the Pale of *Religion*, but against that Party, which reckons it an *Essential Mark of the Church*. And let them take their Choice, whether it shall be accounted among things *Indifferent*, and *Necessary*: If the *Former*, Obey the *Imposition*; if the *Latter*, let them produce their *Authority*.

If the *Foundation* be mislay'd, the *Building* will hardly stand; or, which is worse, it falls upon the *Builder*.

He says, his Aim is *Unity*, and truly so is mine: but *Unity* in such a Composition will never set us right. Two may agree in

the same point of Verity; but then that Truth must, for itself, be entertain'd, without considering one another. If about any thing *Material* we differ, fly to the *Judge of Truth*, the *Scriptures* and the *Church*; if about *Less*, and *Common Matters*, go to the *Rule of Duty* (in such Cases) the settled *Law*. But I forget my self.

It must needs be (says the Deliberator) the Wisdom of this State to smother all dividing Factions, and to abolish all partial Interests, that the common Interest of England may be alone exalted, pag. 14.

The best Rule of Interest is the Law.

I hope he does not mean, by *State*, the *Keepers of the Liberties*; if the *Supreme Authority* of this Nation, as it is Legally Vested in the *King*, the *Man* has kill'd himself. What are *Dividing Factions*, but such Parties as start from that *Common Rule*, the *Law*, which every State is bound upon a Principle of *Policy*, and *Honour* to preserve Sacred, and Inviolable.

The *Law* is but the *Wisdom* treasured up of many Ages; only an amasse of all those lights which long *Experience*, strict *search* and *Industry*; and many Consultations of great Statesmen, have given to the Discovery of our true Interest. Great Reason is there to Approve so great *Authority*: and as great shame it were not to avow what we our selves have done; (The *Law* being but an Universal Vote) besides the penalty of *Disobedience*. How *Mad* then, how *Ignoble*, and how *Desperate* shall we esteem that Faction, that breaks through all these Bonds of *Reverence*, *Honour* and *Prudential Security* to force that Sanctuarie, wherein as *Christians*, and as *Men* we have reposed, *First*, the protection of our *Religion*; and *Then* the Arbitration of our *Lives* and *Fortunes*.

From such Dividers, *Heaven deliver us*, first, and then preserve us.

All Enterprises (says our Author very rationally) that have their beginning in Judgment, and not in passion, are directed to a certain end set up as a mark, and that end is not a business at rovers; but some particular steddie issue of things certainly or probably apprehended and expected: Wherefore let wise Men consider the mark, whereat they level, and to what Issue and state of things their Actions tend. Pag. 36. Most certain 'tis, without that mark men go they know not whither, *First*, the *End*; then, the *Way*; is (I suppose) the *Common Method* of all *Wise Men*: and his advice to *such*, to look before them, might have been spared, they would have don't

don't without it. Now to his Business: But first I'll clear the Way to't. The *Question* is,

Whether the fomenting of these Discords (viz. in Matters of Discipline) do not proceed from a Carnal Design? And he debates the Matter with the Episcopalians, Pag. 33. Here is a Numerous Party, not of the Dregs and Refuse of the Nation, but of the Judicious and Serious Part thereof: What will they do with them? and how will they order the Matter concerning them? Would they destroy them? I solemnly profess that I abhor to think so by the Generality of the Episcopal Perswasion: I would disdain to mention such an unreasonable Impiety, were it not to shew the inconsiderate and absurd Proceedings of an unalterable Opposition, as that it cannot drive to any formed End and Issue. That Protestants should destroy Protestants, for dissenting in the point of Ceremonies, and sole Jurisdiction of Bishops, is so dreadful a violation of Charity and common Honesty, that it is a most uncharitable and dishonest thing to suppose it of them. What then? would they bear them down, or keep them under hard Conditions? Shall all Persons that cannot yield exact Obedience to Ecclesiastical Injunctions, concerning all the Parts of the Liturgy, and Ceremonies, be suspended and deprived as formerly? Shall Ministers of this Judgment be cast and kept out of Ecclesiastical Preferment and Employment? Shall all private Conferences of Godly, Peaceable Christians, for mutual Edification, be held unlawful Conventions? It hath been thought by wise men to be against the Rules of Government, to hold under a rigid Yoke a free People, of such a Number and Quality, and intermingled in all Estates and Ranks, and intimately conjoyned with all Parts of the Body Politique, that it is almost impossible to exclude their Interest from a considerable Share in Publick Actions.

We are so often told of this *Judicious, serious Party*, pray let's allow them to be a Company of very fine Gentlemen, and mind our business. I think he says they are *numerous* too. So were the Frogs that came into the King's Chamber: and what of that?

In good truth, altogether, it is a very pretty *Anagram* of *Sedition*. If it wants any single Circumstances that's needful to procure a Tumult, I am exceedingly mistaken.

Mark it; here's *Number, Conduct, and Pretence of Right, to Embolden*, and to *Fix the Multitude*: Then, to *Provoke*, and *Heighten* them, old Sores are rub'd up; they are minded how they were used so long ago; and hinted yet of worse behind, if they have not a care betimes. What is all this to say, but,

Gentlemen, you remember how it was with you formerly; if you have a mind to have any more on't, so. But things are well enough yet; for be confident, you have those will stand by you, that know what to do, and enough to make their hearts ache. Why 'tis against all Rule of Government, to put this yoke upon a Free People.

If the Author be within hearing, he should do well to be his own Expositor. In the mean while compare we the Gloſs with the Text.

He ſpeaks now in his own words, which the Reader may find by conſerring them with the entire matter of the laſt Quotation, to be extracted with ſtrict juſtice to his meaning.

Here is (ſays he) a numerous Party, of the judicious and ſerious part of the Nation: what will they (the Episcopalianſ) do with them? &c. would they deſtroy them? &c. I ſolemnly profeſs, that I abhor to think ſo of the generality of the Episcopalian perſwaſion, &c. ſhall they be ſuſpended, and deprived as formerly? ſhall all private conferences of Godly, peaceable Chriſtians, for mutual Edification be held unlawfull Conventicles? It hath been thought by wiſe men to be againſt the Rules of Government to hold under a rigid yoke a Free People of ſuch a Number, and Quality. —

This is cutting of a Mans Throat with a Whetſtone. Truly Horace his ſaying- would ſound very well from this Gentleman.

— Fungor vice Cotis, acutum
Reddere quæ ferrum valet, exors ipſa ſecundi.

My Office is to Whet, not Cut.

To tie him up now to his own Philoſophy, which is, (according to his fore-alleged Poſition) that all Rational Enterprizes propoſe ſome certain end, unto which end, all wiſe men conform their mediate Actions. If it be ſo, (as we are agreed upon it) then by that very reaſon which directs him to chuſe the means, are we enabled likewise to gueſs the end.

His

His End he says is Peace; and in this Treatise he hath chalk'd his way to't. He's a *wise man*, and certainly proceeds in order to the Mark he levels at. Let him be judged by his own Rule.

To mind the peevish, of old Grievances, and in so doing to transport the honest with a just sense of new indignities; *Is this the way of Peace?*

*Presbyterian
method of
making Peace.*

To break a Solemn Law, that Law that saved the Breakers of it; to abuse the Mercy of that Prince that made it: and to traduce the Government of his Father, whom they themselves destroy'd; and which is worse, to justify all this; *Is this the way of Peace?*

To startle the mad brutish Rabble with dangerous apprehensions; to lay the justice of their cause before them, and when they are ripe for mischief, to shew them Men, and Arms, — *Is this the way of Peace?* — Then let me learn which is the way of Tumult.

Shall Protestants destroy Protestants, (says he) for dissenting in the point of Ceremonies? No, but the Law shall destroy Subjects, for attempting to Rule their Governors.

Touching their *Conventicles*, since they fall in my way, I think of them, as of the Painter's Bad God, that made a Good Devil: I take them to be none of the best Churches, but for ought I know, they may make excellent — I beg only to observe now the equity of these good Folks.

Is it for the service of Christ, and the encrease of his Kingdom the Church, that so many able Divines should be debarred the use of the Lords Talents, that so many laborious Ministers should sit still in silence; that when Christ teacheth us to pray that the Lord would thrust forth Labourers into his Harvest, those Labourers should be thrust out of his Harvest? Surely this would make a cry in the ears of the Lord of the Harvest. Pag. 31.

Do none of the Woes in the Gospel belong to this talker of it? The service of God went merrily on, in the Thorough-Reformation; did it not? When not a Minister kept his living but to the hazzard of his Soul; and in several places, (where the allowance was small) neither Sacrament nor Sermon, for divers years together. But in those days, the Covenant kept all in good Order.

With what a monstrous confidence does this man press a Text, which the whole Nation knows it is clear against him! And all in Scripture phrase forsooth: *Ne sine forma tantum scelus fiat*, for the honour of the exploit. These People use Religion, just as the Lon-

don-Cooks do their pickled *Barbaries* : they garnish with it. It serves for every thing : I know not how it is, but they do't, because they find the Women like it. When the *Episcopal*, and *Loyal Clergy*, their *Wives*, *Children*, and *Families* were swept entirely away by that SCOTCH PLAGUE the COVENANT ; That made no cry sure in the ears of the Lord of the Harvest. Let the great Judge of all the world determine it.

If the neglect of Brotherly Pacification bold on, and the Hierarchy resolve upon their own advancement to the highest pitch, one may well conclude, that they make a full reckoning to wear out the Presbyterians, and to swallow up their Interest, conceiving they are able to effect it by degrees ; and that greater changes than these have been wrought without much ado. Pag. 39.

Let but the meanest Soul alive now judge of these mens Consciences ! (I speak of those that tumult since the *Act of Pardon*) As deep a forfeiture as ever was made by mortals, the King hath remitted to them. They have cost the Nation more than they have left it worth, beside the *Blood*, the *Grief*, and *Desolation* they have brought upon it. This notwithstanding, they have at this instant the self-same Interest they ever had, as to *Freedom*, and *Safety*, and otherwise *more* : They keep what they have got ; beg, and get *more* ; and are not yet content unless they Govern too. But this is but another Alarm, as who should say, *Look to your selves my Masters* ; lose not an Inch, for if you do, they'l do your Business by degrees.

By and by, among other concurring advantages, to the great Changes Queen *Elizabeth* wrought in Religion ; he reckons this for one.

Popery (says he) being in substance a Religion contrary to what was publicly professed, had no advantage for encrease by publick Preaching, or Books, publicly allowed. Pag. 42.

Nothing more certain, than that the Freedom of the Press and Pulpit, is sufficient to embroyl the best ordered Government in the World.

All Governments have their Disorders and their Male-contents : The one makes use of the other, and here's the ground of all Rebellions. Some Real faults are first found and laid open to the People, which, if in matter of popular Freedom, or Religion ; so much the stronger is the Impression ; the vulgar being naturally stubborn, and Superstitious. Bring it to this, a very little industry carries it on at pleasure. They shall believe impossibilities,

licies, Act eagerly, they know not what, nor why; and while they reach at *Liberty* grasp their own *Fetters*. Their unhappiness is, they can better *Phanſie* a Government without any faults, than brook one that hath *ſome*. Add but to this ditterper, Licentious Pamphlets, and Seditious Sermons, the world ſhall never keep that People quiet.

Wherefore, ſince on all hands it is agreed, that *Printing*, and *Preaching* in oppoſition to a *publick eſtabliſhment*, are of ſo dangerous conſequence, by the force of the Gentlemans own Rule we ought to hear no more of their Diſcipline from the *Preſs* or *Pulpit*. Obſerve his next Coherence.

There are now in England thouſands of Miniſters diſſatisfied in the Hierarchy and Ceremonies, who are all competently and many of them eminently learned. They are not generally of light ſpirits, but ſteady and well reſolved, and tenderly affected touching their ſpiritual liberties. Pag. 42.

Take notice firſt, how *many*, and how *reſolute* they are. That is, take notice *again*, for we have had it exceeding often. His *Reſolute thouſands* make me think of the Tribes repairing to *David*. But they are diſſatisfy'd he ſays: it may be 'tis becauſe they are not *Biſhops*: Yet truly if they be ſo well *reſolved*, methinks they ſhould not be diſſatisfy'd with that they cannot help. I'll aſk but two Queſtions, and I have done.

1. *Are any of thoſe tender-Conſcienc'd thouſands, that are ſo tenderly affected toward ſpiritual Liberties, thoſe Presbyterians that denied the King the freedom of His own Chaplains?*

2. *Had any of theſe eminently learned thouſands a hand in the Aſſembly's Letter to the Reformed Churches of France, the Low-Countries, &c. — (as great a Schiſm in Learning, as the other was in Religion) He comes now to the point indeed.*

Commonly (ſays he) thoſe People who try all Doctrines by Scripture, and are ſwayed more by its Authority, than by the Ordinances and Cuſtoms of Men, do much heſitate and ſtagger concerning the ſole Jurisdiction of Biſhops, the Pomp of the Hierarchy, and Sacred Myſtical Ceremonies of Humane Inſtitution. And therefore let the Episcopall Party never look to be rid of theſe Difficulties, till they remove the Matter in Queſtion, whereat a knowing People are always ready to ſtumble, pag. 43.

Well! ſince the Gentlemen will have it ſo, grant, for Diſpatch, the thing he preſſes; to wit, that they do *Heſitate* and *Stagger*. 'Tis hard, that when upon a private Search, the Queſtion

sion hangs in Ballance, the casting in the Authority of the Church, and the great weight of Christian Charity, should not be yet enough to turn the Scale. *He that Doubts, Sins*; will not excuse that man, who, *because he thinks he stands, refuses to take heed of falling.*

But let him *Doubt*, nay more, let him *Resolve*; all is but for *Himself* still, not for *Me*. When he comes once to muster up his Thousands, and talks of Parties, his Plea of Conscience is gone, and doubtless, these violent and publick Sticklers for the Scrupulous (that is, in such and such Particulars) are the greatest Enemies they have. It casts a Scandal upon the very Cause of Conscience, when those who evidently want it in themselves, plead for it in others. Upon this Subject, exceedingly well says Mr. Lloyd, in a late Treatise of *Primitive Episcopacy*, Pag. 80. *It becomes not good men to censure us for using those Rites and Ceremonies, which we are perswaded not to be prohibited by God's Law, and both they and we do surely know to be commanded to be used, by Man's Law duly made, which is God's Ordinance, to which we must be subject for Conscience sake.* And a little after, — *If any will attempt to be Authors of Combinations, to extort, by shew of Multitudes, and by Tumults, the Alteration or Abrogation of any part of the Established Laws, Civil or Ecclesiastical, they will thereby evidently manifest themselves to be but meer Pretenders to a Tender Conscience, and Power of Godlineß; for they that labour to extort a part, if they prevail, must have the whole in their power. And can they that attempt so great Robbery, love God, and the Power of Godlineß? By this cursed Fruit we know these to be most vile Hypocrites.* Now to our Adversary.

The Gentleman desires to clear the *Presbyterians* of being no *Phanaticks*; and we'll give him the hearing.

It is said that the Presbyterians promoted the King's Return, not out of good will to His Majesty, or a love of Order and Unity, but out of fear of being destroy'd by the Phanaticks, Pag. 54. To this I shall say little, but that I believe there was more in't than so. Let him argue upon it.

The pretended Reason of their Insincerity, seems to me to add much to their Reputation in that behalf: For if the Phanaticks would destroy them, it is manifest that they are none of them. Phanaticks would not destroy themselves willingly. The several various Sects will wrangle with each other in Verbal Contests; but they never knowingly plotted or banded against each other upon the account of their different Opinions,
but

but did all unite in one common Principle of pretended Liberty of Conscience, and in one Common Cause of Universal Toleration, Ibid.

A pleasant Reasoning! A man would think *Christianity* as strong a Tie as *Phanaticism*; and yet we see *Christians* destroy one another. But come to the Point. What's more familiar, than for a couple of Curs to hunt the same Hare, and when they have catch'd her, worry one another for the Quarry? I'll tell this Gentleman a thing now, shall make him take me for a Conjuror: I'll tell him the true Reason why those *Presbyterians* help'd his Majesty in, that are not Quiet now they have him: Not for fear of the *Phanatics*; he made that Objection himself, for ought I know: But here 'tis; (still saving to my self the Freedom of my interpreting my own Words.)

I speak only of those Presbyterians that since His Majesties happy Return, are yet fomenting of new Troubles.

The *Presbyterian* Faction have been ever constant to the Rule and Method of doing their own Business in the King's Name; and this went far with the simple and well-meaning People; but let not any man believe this Interest did their Work.

The ruin of his blessed Majesty, was that unhappy Agreement with the Covenanters in 1639. after so horrid an expence of Time and Money, as gave the greatest benefit Imaginable, to their Interest, and an equal disadvantage to his Own. The King by this expence being grown Poor; and They Strong by the Delay, was more and more oppress'd, till at the last the Field was clear'd: He and his Party in appearance Lost.

The *Presbyterians* do their own Business in the King's Name.

What did these great Pretenders then for the good of King and Church, but share the Booty, and exercise a Power themselves ten thousand times more Turkish than ever they called That they had abolished? What hindered then the Settlement of this Nation upon its *Legal Basis*, (as they phrase it) if the good People had but had a mind to it? Who kept the King from his Parliament? Or was he ever nam'd? but with relation to the Loss of Right as well as Power.

Well, but at last, these people take their turns too, and then the King's a Gracious Prince again. These Factions are of kin to *Montaignes* Family, where the Son beats the Father from generation to generation. Now we come near our purpose.

Look back into the *Scotch* defeat in 1648. Not any thing more clear sure, than that the *Presbyterian* Party, would they but frankly have clos'd with the Kings Tryed Friends in that Engagement; without a Miracle, they must have carried it. Those Few they had, did well nigh all that was considerable in the Action.

See afterward, in 50, and 51. how dirtily upon this very account, the *Presbyterian* crew treated his Majesty: and look quite through their *Interregnum*; they have observed the same indisposition of uniting with the Kings Party, but still shaking the Head, with an *Alas! poor Gentleman!* at the mention of our persecuted Sovereign. Not to insist upon Particulars; *They* never would joyn with *Us* to help His Majesty, *we* never refused with *them*. Now comes the Myserie of the Reserve. Say they,

If we can order Matters so as to get the Kings *Person* in the head of us, and keep out his *Party*. Their hands are ty'd by a Principle of Duty; Our Power is enlarged upon an Interest of favour, and we can play our Game at pleasure. That is, Wee'l not forget to mind him of his Restorers, and now and then a Whisper, how Debaucht the Gentry's grown: how unfit this man is for *Trust*, that for *Temper*, and a Third for *Conduct*.

We may then propose the naming of Officers, and we're to blame if we forget our selves. By these Degrees and ways Time and a little Patience will wear them out; or if it were nothing else, the very Poverty we have reduc'd them to, would make them soon Contemptible.

Whereas should we but offer once a General agreement with that Party, our Design's spoyl'd, for they'll be more than we shall well know how to master. No, no, that must not be. Our Interest lyes to take in just so many, as when they have done our Work, we may be able to turn out again. So much for That.

This is the very Soul of the rigid *Presbyterians*. *Where is our Charity and Regard* (they cry) *to publick tranquillity, if we reject the sure and only means of Concord*, Pag. 60. He should have rather said, where is our *Providence*. if we admit so sure an Introduction to Confusion. To comply with one Importunity of this nature, is to Authorize, and encourage more, and to please all, is totally Impossible.

The *Canons* stick in his Stomack notably, they force too much, and bring in *Poperie*. *Shall not the Laity be allow'd to search the Scriptures,*

tures, nor try the Doctrines delivered, but acquiesce in what their Teachers say, without the exercise of their own Reasoning, or Judgment of Discretion? Pag. 61.

Yes, let them search the Scriptures, as their Teacher may the Laws; yet by their Leave, the Church, and Bench must interpret them. What Difference is there betwixt King James's Phanaticks, and King Charles's, save that they ascribe one and the same Effect to several Causes; both claiming equal Certainty; the One, from his Judgment of Discretion: the Other, from Divine Impulse? What Work shall we have when every Taylor shall with his Judgment of Discretion cut out his own Discipline, and set it up for a Fashion. When these Men and their Bibles are alone together, (as Hooker says) what Phrenses do they call Directions of the Spirit? He comes now to the Politicks.

It is a chief point of knowledge in those whose work it is to mould and manage a Nation according to any order of things, to understand what is the temper of the people, what Principles possess and govern them, or considerable Parties of them, and to what passe things are already brought among them, Pag. 62.

The more a Prince considers this, the less will he afford a Scotch'd English Presbyterian. By Temper he's Ambitious; and Unthankful; ever Craving; and never Full: Govern'd by Principles Insociable, and Cruel. He rates his Party, his Piety, and his Kindness twenty times greater then they are, and rather than confess that he is out in his Reconing, he shall face any other man down that One, on the wrong side of a Cipher is 1000.

Lastly, in Considering to what pass things are brought among them, he will bethink himself likewise how they came to be so.

A State may probably root out such Opinions as it conceives to be heterodox and inconvenient, by using great severity in the beginning, when the Opinions are but newly sowed in mens minds, and the People are of such a nature, as to abhor dangers, and aim to live securely, and when the Nation in general is devoted to the ancient custom of their Fore-fathers. But the same course may not be taken when the Opinions have been deeply rooted and far spread, by long continuance, in a Nation of a free spirit, and zealous; and the generalitie of those, that in a Lawlessence are called Cives, do not desert them, Pag. 63.

Truly in this Case, if Heterodox Opinions cannot be rooted out, the Men that publickely maintain them must: and the rather, if they be free, and jealous: for there's the more danger in their further Progress. Especially if such Opinions prescribe from the

success of Treason. For There, even in matters of themselves very Allowable, I would not leave the least mark of an approbation. It gives too great an honour to *Rebellion*. Provided always that I act at Liberty, and free from Pre-ingagements.

Where there is such a Real Cause of Fear, as is here shadow'd to us; That Prince that loves his Empire, or his Honour, must struggle with it betimes: *Safety* or *Pleasure*, such a people perhaps will be content to allow in exchange for sovereignty: But for the rest, that Prince is lost that puts himself on the Asking side.

It never says, this Rule: *when subjects earnestly press for more than they ought, they aim at more yet than they ask.* They are already past their Duty, and short of their Ambition.

In such a Case, as This, Rigour is the only Remedy: great Aptness to forgive is entertain'd with greater Proneness to offend.

Let it be thought upon; if any Danger, where it lies. Not in the bare Conceit of Phancy, or Dislike, for or against the Matter in Dispute, but in the means that give Form, Growth, and Strength, to those unquiet Motions; and that assemble those Loose scatter'd Sparks into one Flame.

These Instruments are Mercenary *Pulpit-men*, and *Scriblers*; 'tis but removing them, and the Danger's over.

Least he should seem to want a Colour for these Freedoms, he tells us, that *The present Age being more discerning, all sorts affect a greater Liberty of Judgment and Discourse, than hath been used in Former times*, Pag. 65.

This we observ'd, but did not till now impute it to *Discretion*. Suppose they should grow more and more *Discerning*, and their Desires of Liberty grow too; would not these People soon grow Wise enough to *Govern*, that are already grown too good to Obey? 'Tis dangerous trusting of them; yet he assures us otherwise.

This Kingdom after the removing of foundations, is by a marvellous turn re-established upon its ancient basis. And verily that which hath wrought the change will settle it; that which hath brought such things to pass, will keep them where they are, if we do not overlook and sleight it. And what was it but the consent of the Universality, the Vote of all England, Pag. 66.

If all that acted toward this late and blessed Change, meant to Fix here: this needless, ill timed, and dividing Controversie, concerning Ceremonies, would have been spared and those which

which move the Question with such earnestness ; at their *Prayers*, rather, than these *Expostulations*. 'Tis an ill Age when Thieves arreign the Law. That sort of men which ruin'd us, propofes now that very Method by which we were destroyed, to settle us; inviting the diftemper'd people by this Overture, to take their *Poysoners* for their *Physicians*.

'Tis very true, that (under Providence) It was the *Common Vote*, and stirring of the *Nation*, restored the *King*, and the *Law* : and shall we now restrain that univerfal comfort to the Particular Advantage of that single Party, that first invaded them ? How great a blemish were it to the Honour, and Wisdom of the Nation, after fo long, and hard a Tugg, to throw away the summ of the Contest : as if we had wrangled all this while for Shadows ? But to explain my self.

They that think matter of *Ceremony* to be the True reason of the Difference on either fide, mistake themselves. It is the *Law* it self, which is *assaulted* by the One Party, and *defended* by the Other, in the *Particular of Ceremonies* : and it is the King himself that is affronted in the Indignities they cast upon Bishops. To leave the matter clear : There is a Faction which would overthrow the Law, and set up themselves above it ; and These Contrivers put the people upon Cavilling for Ceremonies. They Innocently, under a Mistake of *Conscience*, advance an Interest of *Usurpation*, taking that to be only a Dispute about the Lawfulness of the *Practice*, which rationally pinches upon the validity of the *Power*. It ends in This.

Grant once that a Popular Vote may over-rule a Stated Law, (though but to the value of a Hair) the vertue of that Reason extends to our Freedoms, Lives, and Fortunes, which by the same Rule, they may take away as well as Ceremonies. And (as the case stands) Kings as well as Bishops.

But, seeing this great Revolution hath not happened by the prevailing force of one Party, but by the unstrained motion of all England : what reason is there that one Party should thrust the other out of its due place of rest, upon the *Common Foundation*, Pag. 67.

No reason in the World. The *Law* is our common resting place, the main *Foundation* upon which we are all to Bottom. The Law is an Impartial Judg, let that determine, which place belongs to *Bishops*, which to *Presbyters*, what *Ceremonies* are lawful, and which not.

This

This is a short and a sure way, worth forty of his Coalition.

Having pressed Union hitherto, he proceeds now to remove certain impediments; One whereof is an erroneous Judgment touching the times foregoing the late Wars, Pag. 73.

In truth 'tis pitty the people are no better Instructed. Then let them know from me, those very Principles these folks contend for, were brought by Knox about 1558. from Geneva into Scotland, from thence they were transmitted into England, since which time, the abettors of them in both Nations, have never ceased by Leagues, Tumults, Rebellions, and Usurpations, to embroyl the publique Peace, and affront the Supreme Authority.

They have formally proceeded to the Deposing of Princes, the exercise of an absolute Authority over the Subjects: the abrogation of Laws, the Imposition of Taxes, and in fine to all extremities of rigour as well in matters of Liberty, as of Conscience. He that desires a Presbytery, let him but read Presbyter, for King, in the 1 Sam. 8. and he shall there find what he is reasonably to expect. These were the pranks fore-going the late Wars: and such as these will be again, if people be not the Wiser.

But our Camerade will be none of the Party sure: For, I abhor (sais he) to take upon me the defence of our late-distracted times: the distempers thereof I would not in any wise palliate, Pag. 74.

Interest of
England.
Part 1.
Page 13.
Part 1.
Page 41.
Ibid. 53

Is the wind in that door? Now do I feel by his Pulse, that Crofton's laid by the Heels. He hath forgot, that the War was between the King, and both Houses of Parliament: And that the Presbyterian Party in England never ingaged under a less Authority than that of both Houses of Parliament. And that Presbyterians have never disclaimed, or abandoned their lawful Prince. It may be he means, that he will not justify the Distempers of the other side. But why do we contest? since he tells us, that, *It is the part of weak and selfish minds to contract Religion to certain modes and forms which stand not by Divine Right, but by the wills of men, and which are of little efficacy, and very disputable, and if supposed lawful, ought to be governed by the rule of Charity,* Pag. 75.

I would fain know, which is more tolerable; for the Church to impose upon the People, or the People upon the Church? For the

the People on the one side, to except all, or for the Church on the other side, to bind all. Order it *self* is of Divine appointment; but the manner of Ordering, (save where God himself hath pre-imposed) is left to Humane liking and Discretion. To think (says he) that none is a good Christian, a sound Protestant, a fit Minister, that cannot subscribe to such Modes, and Forms, proceeds from a narrow, and ignoble Judgment, Pag. 75.

He may be a fit Teacher for Geneva, that cannot subscribe to the Form of England; and a fit Minister for England, that cannot conform to the practice of Geneva; they may be both good Christians too, and sound Protestants; yet neither of them fit in transposition. 'Tis one thing to be qualify'd for the Ministerial Function, and another thing to be fit for such or such a Constitution. 'Tis true, he *Officiates* as a Minister; but *thus*, or *so*, as a Subject; and that's the real ground of their Exception. They do not willingly admit the King's Authority in Matters of the Church; and that, which effectually is but their own Ambition, they obtrude upon the World as a high point of Tenderness to the People. There are beyond all doubt, weak Consciences, fit Objects for Indulgence; but the less pardonable are their Misleaders, whose Business 'tis for their own ends to engage the simple Multitude in painful and inextricable Scruples.

Let them Preach downright Treason, stir up the Rabble to Tumult and Sedition; if they chance to be caught and questioned for it, see with what softness they treat their Fellows, and with what supercilious gravity their Superiors.

When some degree of forwardness breaks forth, it is encountred with that severity which hazards the undoing of the weak part, that should and might be healed, pag. 78. And again, to the same effect, (concerning Crofton's Commitment, I imagine) But suppose that some of this way were guilty of some provoking forwardness, should grave Patriots and wise Councillours thereupon destroy the weak part, or rather heal it? A prudent Father is not so provoked by the stubbornness of a Child as to cast him out, and make him desperate while there is yet hope concerning him. It is meet indeed for Princes to express their just indignation, when Subjects presuming on their clemency do not contain themselves within their duty? and the seasonable expression of such disdain, wisely managed, is of great force in Government: nevertheless if it get the mastery it is exceeding perillous. It was the Counsel of indignation that proceeded from Rehobohams young Councillors, Pag. 81.

What

What this language deserves both from the King and his Council, let those that have Authority to punish, Judge.

When Governours resent the non-compliances of a party, their best remedy is to remove the occasions, when it may be done without crossing the Interests of State or Maxims of Government, Pag. 83. That is, if the People will not yield to the Prince, the Prince should do well to yield to the People. A most excellent way for a King that hath to do with Presbyterians : where he shall be sure never to want subjects for his Humility, nor ever to get thanks for his Labour.

Where there are many sufferers upon a Religious account, whether in truth or pretence, there will be a kind of glory in suffering, and sooner or later it may turn to the Rulers detriment, Pag. 84.

There will not be many Sufferers, where there are not many Offenders ; and there will not be many Offenders, where an early severity is used. But however, if any hazard be, he that prints it, dictates, encourages, and promotes it deserves to suffer with the foremost. But the Gentleman begins now to talk like a Christian. *I detest (saies he) and abhor the Tumults, and insurrections of the People, and the resisting of the Sovereign Power, Pag. 98.*

This is honestly said yet : But hold a little. What is that Sovereign Power, which he abhors should be resisted by the Tumults of the People ? Even the two Houses in Co-ordination with the King. A little further, *I am perswaded (saies he) that the Generality of the Presbyterian Denomination would endure extremities, before they would revenge or defend themselves by unlawful means ; as rebelling against their lawful Sovereign, Pag. 98.*

This we shall understand too by confronting it : and find it, only the old Fallacy, a little better colour'd *This part (saies he) of the Supreme power (meaning the two Houses) is indeed capable of doing wrong ; yet how it might be guilty of Rebellion, is more difficult to conceive.* Now if the two Houses cannot Rebel, as being part of the Supreme Power ; (by his Argument) neither can the Presbyterians, in compliance with that Party : So that by this misplacing of the Supreme Authority, whatever hath been Acted by vertue of any Commission from the two Houses, may be done over again, and no Rebellion.

By this device, he only disavows Rebellion so far as this or that, is not Rebellion according to his proposition, although the Law determine otherwise. This is no other

other than what was ever maintained even by those that stood themselves upon the highest terms of disobedience. Did ever any man say, *This is Rebellion, and I'll justify it* ? Nay, I should be glad to hear any of them say, *This was Rebellion, and I'm sorry for it.* But it is evident that the Presbyterians love the King, and Kingly Government, and account themselves happy in his Majesties Clemency, allowing them a just, and inoffensive Liberty in certain matters of Conscience, Pag. 101.

The Presbyterians may find many things to thank his Majesty for: but I would they could hit upon a handsomer manner of doing it; and not perpetually to be craving more, when they should be doing him service for what they have receiv'd already. They love the King, they say; but then their Love is Conditional, they must have something for it.

Would they expose themselves for twenty years together, to Goals and Gibbets, all sorts of Hazards, and Misfortunes for their Prince, and at the last sit down, and starve Contentedly, out of a sence of honourable Loyalty?

That Subject is not right, who hath not brought his mind up to this Frame; however unhappy he may think himself in such Encounters as put him to the Tryal of his utmost Virtue.

Wise men inform us, that a Prince by adhering to one Faction, may in time lift it up above his own Imperial Interest, which will be forced to give way to it as the lesser to the greater. And the prime Leaders of the potent Faction will sway more than the Prince himself. They will become arrogant, unthankful, and boundless in their ambitious designs, Pag. 104.

This is a good Rule, but ill applied; unless return'd upon himself. I hope he will not call *That Party* a *Faction*, which submits all its Actions to the clear Letter of the Law; and he will hardly prove *That* to be *None*, which crosses *This*. If so, let Common Reason judge betwixt us.

There is a saying, which by many hath been taken up for a Proverb, No Bishop No King. I do not well understand the rise of this saying, and therefore dare not speak in derogation of their Judgments who were the Authors of it, But upon the matter it self, I crave to make this modest Animadversion. And first it is degrading to the transcendent interest of Sovereignty, to affix unto it a necessity of any one partial interest for its support: For independency and self-subsistence, without leaning upon any Party, is a Prince's strength and glory. Also it makes that Party over-confident, and its opposite too despondent. Such sayings as import
 O
a Prince

a Prince necessary dependence on any particular Party, may in the mouths of Subjects be too presumptuous, and in the mouth of a Prince too unwary, Pag. 106.

If we are not yet instructed in the Weight, and Reason of that saying, — NO BISHOP NO KING ; Sure we are past learning any thing. We found the sad truth of this Judgment, in the event of the late War ; but that's no Rule. By *No Bishop No King*, is not intended that Bishops are the Props of Royalty, nor do the Episcopalians understand it so : but that both one and the other are Objects of the same Fury ; only the Church goes First : so that without *presumption*, a *Subject* may *affirm* it ; and without loss of Honour a *Prince* may *grant* it.

I might draw Arguments from the Agreement of their *Original*, the likeness of their *Constitution*, the Principles by which they are *Supported* ; and that they lye exposed to the same Enemies, and the same method of Destruction. But this would seem to imply a more Inseverable Interest than I aim at, and raise the Clergy above the proper State, and Orb of Subjects. My meaning is more clear and open.

All Popular Factions take the *Church* in their way to the *State* ; and I am to seek where ever any Prince quitted *Episcopacy*, and saved *Himself*. That is, his *Royal Dignity* ; for the empty *Name of King*, is but the *Carkass* of Majesty. It is with the unruly Populacy, as it is with raging Tides, they press where the Bank is weakest, and in an instant over-run all. If they had either Modesty, or Conscience, they would not force so far : if they have neither, will they stop There ? What did the late King Grant ? or rather, what Deny ? till by their mean Abuse of his unlimited Concessions, he lost his Crown, and Life ? Yet what assurance Words could give him, He wanted not : Words wrapt up in the most Tender and Religious Forms imaginable. But what are Words, where a Crown lyes at stake ?

In fine, *Treason's a Canker* ; and where it seizes, that Prince must early cut off the Infected Part, if he would save the Sound.

The true Church lies in the middle between two extreams, Formalists, and Fanaticks. They are of circumspect and regular walking, no way forward in attempting, or desiring alterations in a Civil State. A Prince doth hold them in obedience under a double Bond. For they know they must needs be subject not only for Wrath, but for Conscience sake. Indeed we will not conceal, that in lawful ways they assert that Liberty which is settled by the known Laws and Fundamental Constitutions,

the

the maintaining whereof is the Prince's as much as the Peoples safety, Pag. 116.

If to be *no way Forward in promoting Changes in the Civil State*, be a mark of the Church: The *Presbyterians* are out of the Pale. It's truth, they are it seems, Assertors of *Lawful Liberty*, in *Lawful ways*: but how is that I pray'e? Did they not tell us this, when their Swords were at our Throats: when it was Death to assist the King? When they were forc'd to fly to the *Equitable* fence of the Law, and quit the *Literal*: and fetch their Arguments from *Inspiration*, because they had none in *Reason*.

I shall here put an End to this Discourse, which is become much longer already than I meant it, by reason of his Addition. *Croftons* ill Fortune I find hath made him *wary*, but not *humble*; for he presses the same Things in substance still, though in somewhat a differing manner of Respect, and seeming Candour. The good Words he gives, belong to those Persons which he shall vouchsafe to Call *serious*, and to think worthy of them; and the Government is to be moulded and disposed of as he pleases.

Finally, he pretends to aim at a Fair, and Christian Accord, and yet proceeds in a direct method of Dividing: by sharp and scandalous Reflections upon the Kings Party.

To say no more, his Reasonings are *Dishonourable* to the memory of the *Late King*: *Seditious* and *Provoking* to the *People*: *Bold* and *Imposing* in themselves; *Repugnant* to the established Law, and to the main scope of the *General Pardon*.

How out of all these ill Ingredients should be composed a National, and healing Balm, I shall now give the Reader leisure to consider.

Male imperatur, ubi regit Vulgus Duces.

F I N I S.